INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 5. (NEW SERIES.) | MAY, 1896. | Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	129
The Indian Budget, by Professor A. F. Murison, L.L.D.	134
Venereal Diseases in the European Army in India, by Professor Stuart, M.P.	135
The Duty of the Liberal Party towards India, by A. G. Symonds, M.A.	136
Land Revenue Assessment in Madras, by Alexander Rogers	137
The British Empire League, by J. Dacosta	139
The Indian Budget: What Indian Critics think	141
Reactionary Enterprises—and after	145
Political Science	147
Intellectual India	148
Our London Letter	150
Indian Military Expenditure, by D. E. Wacha	151
The Cost of Solvency to India	154
The "Forward" Policy: A Blundering Agreement	155
Reviews: Sketches by Pai	157
Self-Criticism	159
About the Burman	160
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	160
Recent Official Publications	160

Indiana.

The Indian Budget. Elsewhere in this issue will be found an article by Professor A. F. Murison upon the Indian Budget, and a series of extracts from speeches and articles by Indian critics upon the expenditure of the revenues which they raise, but are not in any degree permitted to control. Public speakers and writers in the United Kingdom have, during the past fortnight, called attention to the "hundred million Budget" which the Chancellor of the Exchequer recently explained in the House of Commons, and which will be fully discussed by the elected representatives of the tax-payers before it is sanctioned. The Indian Budget (if, for the sake of comparison, Rs. 10 may be regarded as equivalent to £1 sterling) deals with more than a hundred millions, and every rupee that it disposes of involves a far greater sacrifice on the part of the Indian taxpayer than the sacrifice of a florin by a taxpayer in the United Kingdom. Yet the Indian Budget was dismissed at a single sitting, without amendment and without a division. The Indian members of the Viceroy's Council did, indeed, raise their voices in protest. But their warnings and remonstrances were unheeded, and could have no adequate effect. The debate on the Indian Budget in the House of Commons will be hardly less perfunctory and unsatisfactory. It will come on during the closing days of the Session. The attendance will be meagre, and the discussion more or less academic. The House of Commons will not be asked to approve the expenditure proposed by Sir James Westland for the current year. It will merely give its assent to the proposition that the total expenditure and the total revenue of the Government of India from April, 1894, to March, 1895, are correctly shown in the closed accounts. Lord Welby's Commission, unless rumour be false, has been looking into the mechanism of Indian finance. Lord Welby and his colleagues will fail in their duty unless they recommend drastic reform of a system which could not have been more ingeniously contrived to stereotype irresponsible authority in the hands of bureaucratic officials, and to withhold from the House of Commons both adequate knowledge and effective control. The present system might be less pernicious if Finance Ministers in India showed more disposition to hear courteously the opinions of those who merely pay the taxes. Sir James Westland makes a bad system worse, and its consequences more dangerous, when he permits himself to brush aside non-official critics as the unfortunate victims of "delusions" and "hallucinations."

A Legacy of Permanent Expenditure. There is no need to refer here to what is said on another page with regard to the Famine Insurance Fund, the occupation of Chitral, the pressure of taxation, the raid upon Provincial surpluses, the harsh landlordism of the Government, the "forward" frontier policy,

and the grievous burden of military expenditure. "The Financial Statement," said Sir James Westland, "is not the place in which to defend the policy of the [Chitral] expedition or the occupation which has followed it." The Finance Minister thus relieved himself of a task which he would manifestly have found intolerable. For the Budget provision for the Chitral expedition was merely Rx. 150,000, while, in the words of the Financial Statement,

"The Chitral expedition has cost us Rx.67,200 in the accounts of 1894-95, Rx. 1,647,500 in the revised estimate of 1895-96, and a further sum of Rx. 20,000 will come under payment in 1896-97, giving a total of Rx. 1,734,700 in India, besides a sterling expenditure in replacement of stores of £16,000. It has left us a legacy of permanent expenditure in the occupation of Chitral and of its communications, which has involved in 1895-96 an expenditure of Rx.102,200, and will involve in 1896-97 an expenditure of Rx. 231,700."

Sir J. Westland explains in a footnote that these figures are irrespective of the "political" expenditure. Now, Mr. Balfour last November, professing, amid the cheers of a Glasgow audience, to "sweep away the arguments which had been urged against the retention of Chitral," dealt with the financial question in these words:

"It was said, in the second place, that it would cause an augmentation of the Indian army. It was said, in the third place, that it would greatly add to the expense of Indian administration. . . . . Well, I will dispose of these arguments in almost as many sentences. . . . . Let me tell you, with regard to the second argument, which states that augmentation of the Indian army would be required, that not one single soldier need be added to the Indian army in order to retain Chitral, and that the expense of the operation is one which is absolutely insignificant."

Lord George Hamilton had spoken to the same effect in the House of Commons in September. He had stated, indeed, that the cost of retention would be merely £13,000, although, at the suggestion of the House, he afterwards multiplied this figure by 10. These roseate estimates contrast painfully with Sir James Westland's accounts, and the contrast shows once again how foolish it is, where schemes of trans-frontier aggression are concerned, to accept the forecasts of those who resolve upon the enterprise first and count the cost afterwards.

The Optimism of Sir J. Westland. Sir James Westland's conclusions are a piece of optimism which the House of Commons will do well to correct by reference to Indian criticism. "Our revenues," he says, "are advancing, our expenditure is well in hand; but, above all, the rate of exchange shows a tendency to establish itself at a figure which, if maintained, will remove our most serious anxieties." "If maintained" is a curious foundation for the hopes of a prudent financier. Besides, the embarrassments of the Government of India have notoriously been due not to that convenient scapegoat, loss by exchange, but to the Government's persistent refusal to cut its coat according to its cloth. If the present rate of exchange be maintained it will, unless the Government of India mends its ways, only provide so much the more for the spendthrift to squander. "Our revenues are advancing"—but how? Paragragh 111 of the Financial Statement says that "we are usually able to count on an increase of land revenue from year to year." Exactly. The Government of India is a harsh landlord, and its severe enhancements of land revenue have given rise to widespread discontent. The last turn, it appears, has been given to the screw, and now "Burma is the only Province in which an appreciable increase is expected." "Our expenditure is well in hand"—but is it? Paragragh 123 sets forth the several departments in which the most important increases in expenditure have taken place. The least (Rx. 61,400) is for Education. The largest (Rx. 409,600) is for the army. The former sum, we are curtly informed, is merely "the usual increase of Provincial expenditure by the Governments which can afford it." To the latter must be added, among other items, Rx. 68,800 for military works (where, again, the occupation of Chitral has caused an increase). There is food for thought also in Sir J. Westland's remark that "the provision of £30,000, made in 1895-96 for the visit to England of the son of the Amír of Afghanistan, is not required next year." And, of course, over and above the detailed provisions of a Budget, we have to remember those larger considerations, to which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has so patiently called attention, with reference to the unceasing drain of tribute from India to this country in the form of salaries, pensions, and the like. It is nearly twenty years since John Bright said at Manchester:

"I say that a Government put over two hundred and fifty milli ns of people, which has levied taxes till it can levy no more, which spends all that it can levy, and which has borrowed £100,000,000 more than all that it can levy—I say a Government like that has some fatal defect which, at some not distant time, must bring disaster and humiliation to the Government and to the people on whose behalf it rules."

How it strikes an Indian. A Bombay correspondent writes with reference to the Indian Budget: "A series of windfalls, pure and simple, have like the good fairy come to the help of the embarrassed treasury, and the Finance Minister crows over his sudden good fortune which enables him, after making good the deficit on exchange in the accounts for 1894-95, and after restoring the Famine Fund to the extent of a crore, to show a surplus of 69 lakhs. For the ensuing year there is to be an estimated surplus of 46 lakhs, while the revised estimates for the year just closed show a surplus of 95 lakhs. These facts show how much uncertainty surrounds Indian finance. Of course, exchange is a disturbing factor. It contributes to the conversion

of deficits into surpluses and *vice versa*. But it also proves that when there is something like a handsome surplus, the Government disposes of it in increased expenditure without remitting a pie of taxation. This year the Government has again made a new departure, on the plea that it is now unnecessary, after the experience of eighteen years, to set apart so large a sum as $1\frac{1}{2}$ crores for the Famine Insurance Fund. Protective railways have been built during the interval, and irrigation works have been constructed. These have to a certain extent diminished the risks of famine; so that in case a severe famine should visit India in future, there is every probability of a smaller expenditure than 15 crores, which the Famine Commission estimated as the average for a single famine. The excuse is plausible. But the obligation to provide $1\frac{1}{2}$ crores from the annual revenues is a wholesome one. It tends to check the Government's extravagance. The reduction of the amount from $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 crore must, from this point of view, be considered as mischievous. In fact, the difference has already been used, or is to be used, for the purposes of the military department, which is never tired of producing cut and dry schemes to swamp whatever revenue it can lay hold of. This time the mobilisation scare has been raised, though no possible enemy on the Hindu Kush is expected, and the Russians are smoking their *hooka* of peace on the other side of the Oxus.

Not even a Pinch of Salt.

"Thus," our correspondent continues, "the half crore withheld from the Famine Insurance Fund goes into the bottomless pit of military finance. How much the masses would have appreciated a remission of the salt duty even to the extent of 4 annas per maund! On the first easement of the finances the Government, without any forebodings of conscience, remitted $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the cotton duties at the behest of Lancashire, but now that an actual surplus, even after that unrighteous remission, can be shown, it refuses to give to the poor relief even to the extent of a larger pinch of salt, the consumption of which has diminished since the enhanced duty was established in 1888. Yet Lord Dufferin in open Council proclaimed that the duty should go as soon as the finances permitted. Another evil arising from the contraction of the Famine Fund to a crore is this. The Fund was partially employed in the reduction of debt. The incentive to reduce debt, even by a half a crore per year, has now apparently ceased to exist. Moreover the diminution of the grant to the Fund is irregular and a breach of faith. The income tax is levied for this very Fund, having superseded the original Licence tax of 1878 when the Famine Fund was established. The diversion of the residue to the purposes of the military department is greatly to be regretted. But the Government of India seems to have no regard for native opinion, and goes on in its march. For the moment, perhaps, the sky looks a little brighter, but when it may darken again one cannot say. Even before the ink was dry upon the the Budget, exchange, which for two weeks had ruled at 1s. $2\frac{12}{16}$d., went down to 1s. $2\frac{4}{16}$d. Such are the uncertainties of exchange. It supplies alike a convenient excuse when the finances are depressed by other causes, and a convenient opportunity of making ducks and drakes with any surplus that may accrue."

The Chitral Papers.

The student of "ways that are dark, and tricks that are vain," will find some interesting reading in the further "Correspondence Relating to the Occupation of Chitral," recently issued as a Parliamentary White-Paper. The Correspondence shows, among other things, how wide of the mark were the wiseacres who declared that the occupation of Chitral would not involve any additional expense nor any breach of the now famous proclamation issued by the Viceroy when the expedition was undertaken against Umra Khan. On January 15th last the Government of India forwarded to Lord George Hamilton estimates — only estimates, be it observed — of the "probable annual extra military expenditure involved by the occupation of Chitral and the line of communication." Here is the little bill:

	Occupation of Chitral. Rs.	Line of Communication. Rs.
Pay	192,000	300,000
Commissariat	300,000	480,000
Transport	28,000	14,000
Movement of Troops and Stores	121,000	170,000
Clothing	97,000	93,000
Ordnance	3,000	12,000
Medical	19,000	32,000
Miscellaneous	26,000	12,000
Telegraph	—	50,000
Postal	22,000	72,000
Total	808,000	1,235,000
Add 10 per cent. for contingencies	80,800	123,500
Grand Total	888,800	1,358,500
Or, in round figures ..	890,000	1,360,000
	2,250,000	

"These estimates," adds the Government of India, with unconscious humour, "may require slight amendment hereafter if certain additional concessions to the troops which are now under consideration, are sanctioned." Moreover:

"in addition to this sum, the expenditure in the Military Works Department on huts for the troops, defensive works, and the maintenance of the roads will probably amount to Rs. 100,000 a year for the next two years. The probable political expenditure is estimated at Rs. 200,000 annually, but the present political arrangements are tentative and liable to

reconsideration next May. The total approximate extra expenditure will, therefore, be annually Rs. 2,550,000. The estimates of military expenditure do not include the cost of retaining the 34th Pioneers temporarily on the Malakand, which we propose to do for six months next year. The extra cost on this account is estimated at Rs. 145,000."

Mr. Balfour had not these figures before him when he rashly stated that "the expense of the operation is one which is absolutely insignificant." He knew nothing of what Sir J. Westland describes as a "legacy of permanent expenditure in the occupation of Chitral." As for the proclamation, which announced that "the Government of India have no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which Umra Khan's misconduct may now force them to pass, or of interfering with the independence of the tribes," the Foreign Secretary telegraphed from Simla to Sir R. Low, as early as August 10th last, that the "Malakand will be held by a brigade, the crossing of the Swat river by a battalion." When further instructions were given to Sir R. Low, he was graciously requested to "point out to the tribes that the present proposals in no way depart from the terms of that proclamation." The process of "pointing out" is more fully described towards the end of the letter:—

"It is not to be expected that these objects can be attained by payments rigidly cut down to the amount of the monthly pay drawn by the levies employed. The goodwill of the tribes is an important factor in the case, and it cannot be ensured without fair and liberal dealing towards the leading men of each section and towards the Chief of the whole line within each tribe's limits."

Hence, of course, the expenditure stated above. Similarly, Major Deane, reporting last September his arrangements with the Khan of Dir, wrote:—

"The total thus amounts to Rs. 54,990 and a further sum of Rs. 5,010. . . . is estimated for payment to individual headmen of the tribes for services as occasion may demand. *This item is absolutely necessary.*"

After this it is mere waste of ink and paper to print in an appendix a collection of petitions from the headmen of native tribes praying for incorporation. These petitions, which the most ordinary "political" officer can of course obtain to order in small or large quantities at the shortest notice, might, we think, have been taken as read. To print them is to carry a joke too far. Besides, it discloses a lack of artistic restraint.

A Blundering Agreement.

The new batch of Chitral papers includes the text of the agreement that was made in November, 1893, between the Amír and the Government of India, represented by Sir H. Mortimer Durand. The third clause of this agreement, which is another piece of conclusive evidence that the Government of India had designs upon Chitral long before Dr. Robertson and his force got into difficulties there, contains the following provisions:—

"The British Government thus agrees to His Highness the Amír retaining Asmar and the valley above it, as far as Chanak. His Highness agrees on the other hand, that he will at no time exercise interference in Swat, Bajaur, or Chitral, *including the Arnawai or Bashgal valley.*"

Here, and in the disastrous consequences of the blunder, we see a characteristic incident in the reckless and ruinous "forward" policy. There is, it turned out, no such place as "the Arnawai or Bashgal valley." On the contrary as Lord George Hamilton had to explain in the House of Commons on April 16th:—

"When the delimitation began in the field it was found that the Bashgal and Arnawai valleys ran in different directions, the Arnawai draining into the Kunar from the east, and the Bashgal river from the west. *The frontier was therefore revised and the revision placed within the sphere of influence of the Amír the Bashgal valley,* which is west of the Kunar river, and *over which the Mehtars of Chitral have claimed rights.*"

A pretty commentary, this, upon the skill of the "experts" who, since the reversal of Lord Lawrence's policy, have been squandering the blood and treasure of India in a series of baneful enterprises beyond her north-west frontier.

The "Forward" Policy in Practice.

The subject is more fully set forth on another page. Here we will call attention to two points, and two points only, in connection with this triumph of Anglo-Indian diplomacy. It is clear, in the first place, that the Government of India believed that the Bashgal valley "over which the Mehtars of Chitral had claimed rights" was included in the territory of Chitral. But they made a mistake in their description of it, and the Amír was able to advance a claim to the valley. In the second place, it is clear that, this claim having been advanced by the Amír, the Government of India acceded to it, although they knew, or ought to have known, that it would lead to the massacre, or the enslavement and the unspeakable degradation, of the fair Kafirs who inhabited that region. Such is the "forward" policy in practice. In order to secure a military post at Chitral, the Government of India hand over to the tender mercies of the Amír the inhabitants of the Bashgal valley—and how tender those mercies are we may judge from Reuter's grim statement (somewhat Bowdlerised by Lord George Hamilton in the House of Commons) that the Amír "is treating *submissive* Kafirs with extreme leniency." Yet it was of this "forward" policy that Lord George Hamilton permitted himself to say in the House of Commons on February 17th:—

"Before sitting down he congratulated his friends behind him that the first time they had to give a party vote last year they were actuated by true political instincts when, by an overwhelming majority, they assented to this forward movement. *He believed there had been no forward movement in recent years made by any Government which had been more beneficial to all concerned.*"

It is inconceivable that Lord G. Hamilton was then ignorant of the blunder in the Durand agreement.

The agreement was only made public because its publication was insisted upon in the House of Commons. Then the blunder was detected. If the agreement had been published in 1893, the worst consequences of the blunder might have been averted. Viewed as a whole, the expedition to Chitral, together with the manœuvres that preceded and the consequences which have followed it, is an apt epitome of the "forward" policy. That policy, which reverses the earlier and saner frontier policy of Lord Lawrence, Lord Mayo, Lord Northbrook, and Lord Ripon, is not only useless but positively dangerous. Strategically, it throws away the natural advantages of India's mountain barrier, and literally paves the way for the invader. Financially, it lies at the root of India's embarrassments. Morally, it is responsible for such incidents as the invasion of Kafiristan, and for heaven knows how much demoralisation besides.

The Indian Parliamentary Committee.

In spite of the reverses of the last General Election the Indian Parliamentary Committee will, it is plain, continue to be an important factor in the House of Commons. We referred last month to the invitation which Sir W. Wedderburn had sent to new members of the House of Commons to join the Committee, and we printed the names of the thirty-three gentlemen who had accepted the invitation. To these we have now the pleasure of adding the names of Mr. W. Allan, Dr. Cameron, Mr. A. E. Hutton, Mr. J. H. Maden, Mr. E. J. C. Morton, Mr. J. C. Rickett, and the Hon. Philip Stanhope. Thus, up to the present time, forty of the new members have joined the Indian Parliamentary Committee, bringing its total strength to the respectable figure of 125. No Government and no majority can ignore the representations of so large a section of the House of Commons. Within this larger body there is, as our readers are aware, a smaller Working Committee, which consisted originally of Messrs. W. S. Caine, J. E. Ellis, J. G. Swift MacNeill, W. S. B. Maclaren, Dadabhai Naoroji, J. H. Roberts, C. E. Schwann, S. Smith, H. J. Wilson, and Sir W. Wedderburn. Mr. Caine, Mr. Maclaren, Mr. Naoroji, and Mr. Webb are no longer members of the House of Commons, and the Indian Parliamentary Committee met on April 21st, in one of the Committee Rooms of the House of Commons, to elect their successors. The choice of the Committee fell upon Dr. Clark, Sir John Leng, Mr. C. P. Scott, and Mr. Robinson Souttar, who have consented to act, and who will bring to the Working Committee the very highest qualifications. In "Our London Letter" we give some account of their careers. The people of India may well congratulate themselves upon having secured such valuable allies and spokesmen in the House of Commons.

The Cotton Duties.

The Indian Parliamentary Committee, formed in July, 1893, is really a revival of the informal Indian Committee which, in 1883, with the help of Mr. John Bright, sought to secure "combined Parliamentary action in matters affecting Indian public interests." Mr. Bright's committee, in its turn, was a revival of the the Indian Reform Society, founded in 1853, chiefly through the exertions of Mr. John Dickenson, for the purpose of promoting combined and well-directed action among the friends of India, and especially of securing full and impartial enquiry before the renewal of the charter of the East India Company in 1854. By joining the Indian Parliamentary Committee a member does not pledge himself to support any particular measures, but "expresses his willingness to co-operate in favour of a just and sympathetic policy towards India." The appointment of Lord Welby's Commission, which is now enquiring into the administration and management of Indian expenditure, was due to the efforts of Sir W. Wedderburn and his colleagues, although the enquiry was not granted by Sir Henry Fowler in the form they asked. It seems probable that the efforts of the committee will next be directed towards readjustment of the Indian cotton duties. The case of the poorest class of Indian consumers had already been laid privately before Lord George Hamilton, and the Indian Parliamentary Committee on April 21st approved a memorial recommending and justifying an important modification of the new duties. We hope next month to print the text of the memorial, together with Lord G. Hamilton's reply. Meanwhile it may be assumed that the aim of the Committee is to secure the exemption from all duty, whether import or excise, of cotton cloths which do not contain any yarn of higher count than twenties. The grounds for this modification were set forth in our columns last month. The modification can, it is believed, be carried out by executive order, and, if Lord George Hamilton refuses to take the necessary steps, it is natural to anticipate that the question will be raised in the House of Commons. Nothing could be more absurd than the statement, to which some Anglo-Indian journals have given currency, that Sir W. Wedderburn and his friends have neglected the question of the cotton duties for the question of Chitral. So soon as the details of the new scheme became known, the India Office was approached with moderate representations of a friendly character. The battle may now shift to the open. If so, Lord George Hamilton will probably discover that the modification suggested by the Indian Parliamentary Committee is cordially supported by the members of his own party, who are best fitted to form an opinion upon the subject.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

By Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.

Sir James Westland has got into the region of surpluses—small indeed, and questionable, but still formal surpluses. The closed accounts for 1894-95 show a surplus of Rx. 693,000. The revised estimates for 1895-96 show a surplus of Rx. 951,000. The Budget estimate for 1896-97 anticipates a surplus of Rx. 463,000. On the face of the figures, then, the financial bark would seem to have run into smooth waters. Sir James Westland would appear to have at length established the solvency of India. He is prudent enough, however, to "refrain from any prophecies as to the future." For such reticence he has especially good grounds, and nobody knows it better than the Finance Minister himself. The fact is that his Budget has got comfortably balanced by sheer good luck. The rate of exchange has happened, in the teeth of all reasonable expectations, to prove favourable to him. The opium revenue, which had been heading downwards, took an upward turn. Even in military expenditure prices have been rather more accommodating; specific outlays have been curtailed or come to the end of a series, and the authorities have availed themselves more largely of manufactures in India. The run of luck is of course unreliable, and apart from the advantages of luck the helpful circumstances have many aspects of serious questionableness.

There is satisfaction in the announcement of the restoration of the Famine Insurance Fund, "with effect from the date of its suspension," even though the amount be reduced from Rx. 1,500,000 to Rx. 1,000,000. The plain and obvious intention of the Fund has been treated with a looseness of interpretation that is amazing, and explicable only by the *force majeure* of necessity. There is substance also in the contention that the dangers of famine have been so far met by the progress of intercommunication that a smaller sum will prove ample for all practical needs that can be fairly anticipated. Sir Charles Elliott, if we remember rightly, used to affirm with emphasis that a famine is now practically impossible; and it may be granted that famine could not now take such a wide and deadly grip of any province or district as it did some twenty years ago. Clearly, however, it is the duty of the Government to err, if error there must be, on the right side, in this momentous matter. The sharpness of the lesson is apt to get blunted in the imagination of a later generation of officials, and the hopefulness of the later remedies is perhaps not likely to be underestimated, especially under financial strain from other quarters.

It is difficult to regard with satisfaction any explanations of amelioration on the point of military expenditure. The re-armament, which has been going on for the last nine years, is said to be substantially completed; and so, with the ensuing year, will be the special defence works. But for how long will such completions stand good? Everybody agrees with the large generalities about keeping up a sufficient military force, and maintaining our position, and so forth. But it is the practical details that land us all in conflict; and with the military bent of mind unmodified and the memory of Chitral still fresh, it is too obvious that even a surplus that does not go beyond six figures will not be devoid of temptation to further adventures. It is hardly worth while now to worry over the details of the Chitral expenditure. They will have to be paid up some time, however they may be deftly distributed in the formal accounts and minimised to the public view. The Malakand garrison, we are told, is to be reduced by one battalion presently, and "it is confidently believed that further reductions will be possible within a short period." But why not reduce it altogether, and at once? The whole policy on which it rests is of less than no value to the country. "But for the mobilisation grant, the army expenditure will be less than it was last year." Yes, there is much virtue, no doubt, in "but for." And "but for" is always available, and always helps to gild the bitterness of the pill to those that are not wise before the event.

The repayment of the provincial contribution is a formal act of grace. We should like, however, to see the provincial governments with a firmer grasp over their little savings. The fund is but a small thing, even for a straitened treasury at Calcutta, and the looting of it is attended with suggestions that do not make for solidarity of co-operation and sentiment. The fine flourish of expansion in railway construction is also meant to tickle the ears of the groundlings. A large programme of railway capital expenditure, illustrated by imposing sums in seven figures, easily gives the impression of a very flourishing state of things and a grand energy of development. The fact, however, is not obtruded that the dividends on such railways will almost bodily be carted out of the country. Very few rupees from this source will find their way into the pockets of the native inhabitants. True, there is the advantage of their existence and their use; but, after all, the advantages come to be onerous from the public point of view. By the time that the natives are able to build railways from their own capital, there will be no lines left to build that are likely to be worth their while.

The cruel thing about the whole financial position is that the favourable aspects of it are not built up on the true and solid prosperity of the country. Part of it comes from fresh taxation piled upon taxation that seemed incapable of sustaining another tier. During the past ten years, new taxation has been imposed to the tune of very nearly sixty millions of rupees, necessitated to fill up the recurrent deficits of the period. To be sure, part of this total is explained by the increase of population—an explanation that really makes matters essentially worse—by extensions of the railways and irrigation works. In addition, there has been collected another sixty millions of rupees, by expansion of taxes already existing. Notwithstanding all this, the Government has been compelled to stop the famine insurance grant, even in a year of threatened famine, to appropriate the provincial reserves, and to get help from the chance rise of the rupee in order just to balance the Budget. At the same time, the salt tax—obnoxious as it is to all men—

has been levied with increased severity on an article of prime necessity to every native; and the land revenue has been squeezed with all the force applicable within the limits of openly expressed discontent of the population. To see the grievous operation of fiscal severities, it is but necessary to follow the statements set forth by Mr. Alexander Rogers in regard to the Presidency of Madras. There, in 1893-94, 209,517 notices for sale of property against land-revenue defaulters were issued, and 14,198 of the Government tenants were sold up. There has been no answer to Mr. Rogers. The Madras Government has been instructed to report to the Home Government. When is it going to report? What can it say in disproof of his figures? Or what possible explanation can reduce the sense of outrage? The formal balancing of the Budget is an exceedingly small matter in face of the actual facts of an oppressive and dangerous administration. The little loans keep coming out from time to time and never get wiped out; and every little loan helps to make the mickle debt of India ever mickler. And when the Budget is cleverly balanced, the loans are left in the background—unseen but pressing steadily and hopelessly.

VENEREAL DISEASES IN THE EUROPEAN ARMY IN INDIA.

BY PROFESSOR STUART, M.P.

An increase of venereal disease is taking place in the Indian Army, and certain ill-informed Members of Parliament and writers in the public press have jumped at the conclusion that this is due to the recent repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts in India, and some have even endeavoured to urge as a remedy the re-establishment of that discarded system. There could be no conclusion wider of the mark and no more inconsequent or fallacious remedy. This I shall now proceed to show.

I have before me the figures of venereal disease in the European Army in India since the year 1871—that is to say, from three years after the first introduction into that country in 1868 of the system variously known as the Contagious Diseases Acts, the lock hospital system, or the system of cantonment regulation. That system, as is now well known, involved the compulsory registration and periodical examination of women, with all the attendant abominations which were exposed in 1888 and again in 1894, when the departmental committee sat which reported on the inefficient manner in which the repeal ordered by the House of Commons in 1893 had been carried out. In these figures the first important thing to be noticed is the continuous advance of these diseases in the Indian Army over the whole period of twenty-four years. The second thing to be noticed is that that advance is in no sense peculiar to the period which has elapsed since the resolution of the House of Commons in June, 1888, which ordered the abolition of the Contagious Diseases Acts. If you take the whole period from 1871 to 1894, the rise has been from 197 to 516 annual entries into hospital per 1,000 men, but the largest portion of this rise—viz., from 197 to 371, took place between 1871 and 1888, the portion of the period during which the Acts were in full force. It is obviously quite impossible from such figures to contend that the increase in the later years is due to repeal.

The Army Sanitary Commission—the chief hygienic authority in the British army—fully corroborates this conclusion. Attention having been called in 1893 to the increase of disease, and an outcry having been made for the reimposition of the Acts, or, as they are also called, the lock hospital system, the facts were laid before that Commission by Lord Kimberley, then Secretary of State for India, and the Commission made a special report. Lord Kimberley sums up that report, which was presented in December, 1893, in the following words:

> "The conclusion at which they arrive is that this system has in India proved a failure and that its reinstitution cannot consequently be advocated on sanitary grounds."

In the following year, 1894, the Army Sanitary Commission repeated this statement—namely, that:

> "The reintroduction of the lock hospital system in India on sanitary grounds could not be recommended."

And again, under date 19th June, 1895, in their most recent utterance, to be found in the first issued report on sanitary measures in India, they say (page 169):

> "Venereal diseases prevail to a lamentable extent as they have done for years. . . . It is hard to conceive a more unsatisfactory state of things in every way; but how it is to be remedied is a problem which we confess we have been altogether unable to solve. After much consideration we recommended certain measures which we understand are as far as possible to be acted on, and we trust that at least some benefit may be derived from them; but we have not recommended the re-establishment of lock hospitals partly because we are well aware that any recommendation of the kind would be a mere waste of time, and still more so because the beneficial results of lock hospitals in India during the time they were in force fell far short of what had been anticipated, and are not such as to favour their being revived."

The recommendations here referred to are summed up by the Commission themselves in the following words:

> "We believe that the best practicable means of diminishing the prevalence of these diseases is to be found in establishing a system of voluntary lock hospitals and in providing the soldier as far as possible with healthy occupation and recreation."

These views have certainly not yet been adopted generally in India. It is not probable that they will be adopted until the officials have made up their minds to cease from hankering after the re-establishment of the old and condemned system. The Commission makes the following pregnant statement:

> "No doubt the increase in the proportion of young soldiers and the decrease in the proportion of married men, as well as the fact that a much larger proportion of the men are new to the country, have had their influence on the results, and have tended to increase the amount of diseases of this class."

At the present moment the moral atmosphere into which we plunge the young and inexperienced men whom we send out as soldiers to India is very grievous. Though the brothel is, since the departmental order of 1894, now no longer registered and licensed inside of the cantonment itself, it is still close at hand,

and often only technically outside. The authorities still look to its sanitation as the sole means of securing health. They will never succeed—experience shows they will never succeed—till they take a new line and aim at attracting the soldiers from, instead of to, that institution.

The Indian authorities might well take a lesson from the condition of things in the home army. There repeal and its consequences have been honestly accepted, with the result that venereal disease, which rose while the Acts were in force, is now steadily on the decline. This will be made evident if we compare the following years: First, the three years succeeding the adoption of the Acts; second, the last three years in which they were in operation; and third, the three years just completed after they have been repealed for a dozen years:—

Year.	Cases per 1,000 Men.
1870	201·0
1871	201·5
1872	202·2
1880	245·9
1881	245·5
1882	246·0
1892	201·2
1893	194·6
1894	182·4

These figures sufficiently show the complete fallacy of imagining that disease is diminished by the presence of the Contagious Diseases Acts, and bear out the conclusions of the Army Sanitary Commission, which, indeed, in quoting the statistics in England, concludes by the observation that

"These figures suffice to show how very little influence the Acts would have had in diminishing venereal disease under conditions more favourable to their operation than those which exist in India."

I will conclude with only one further remark. Disease in the home army of England has diminished markedly during the ten years which have succeeded repeal. In India it has increased during the six years which have succeeded repeal in that country. How is it possible, under these circumstances, to lay the increase in India to the door of repeal? On the contrary, these facts amply bear out the conclusions at which Mr. Samuel Whitbread's committee arrived in 1862, when, after a careful consideration of the operation of such laws in various places, they reported that there was no evidence that any diminution in disease was connected with compulsory regulations. It would have been well if the authorities of that time had accepted the report of that committee; but they did not, and they tried a long experiment of regulation, ending in repeal, and have left it to the Army Sanitary Commission, after an examination of the results of that regulation and repeal in India and in England, to make the statements we have already quoted, which entirely corroborate the views of the committee of 1862. It is abundantly evident, therefore, that other methods than the re-introduction of the lock hospital system must be found for mitigating the disease in the Indian army.

THE DUTY OF THE LIBERAL PARTY TOWARDS INDIA.

By A. G. Symonds, M.A.

No part of the Empire has more cause to regret the result of the General Election last year than India. Not only did many of its best friends in the last Parliament lose their seats—chief amongst whom was that true "Member for India," Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji—but the vast majority of the newly elected members, especially amongst the Conservatives, belong to the class which is most ignorant of India, least sympathetic with the desires and needs of its inhabitants, and most inclined to regard the country as only a special preserve for its younger sons and needy relations to make fortunes in and to get pensions from. They are the people who think and speak of all the natives of India as "black men" or "niggers;" who, if they have ever been out there, describe the country as "a beastly hole;" who scoff at the idea of the natives ever being capable of self-government even in the smallest municipal or parochial affairs; who assert that they have double the vices and none of the virtues of white men; and who believe in their inmost hearts that God only created the peoples of India for the special purpose of being governed by Englishmen. This is the class which for its own selfish ends and advancement is always ready to promote or support any military movement for which India has to pay, and steadily resists all attempts to reduce the expenditure on its administration. Most of these new Conservative M.P.'s have been educated at our Public Schools and Universities; but they know far less of the history and geography of India than of ancient Greece and Rome. Ignorance, lack of sympathy, and racial pride and prejudice, form the outfit of at least four-fifths of the men to whom the electors of England have entrusted the duty of governing themselves and the millions of their fellow-subjects in India and the Colonies.

But while I make this strong indictment against the great majority of the Conservative party I do not think that the Liberal party, either in or out of Parliament, is free from blame. Our leaders in both Houses have, with a few notable exceptions, been content to accept the official statements made with regard to Indian affairs without criticism, much less condemnation; and the rank and file of the party have followed their lead with blind unquestioning confidence, or have abstained altogether from taking part in the debates and divisions on Indian questions. The few men who have held official positions in India are listened to with scant attention; and others who have honestly tried to get to know something about India, either by visiting the country or by careful study of papers and publications dealing with Indian questions, are all set down as so many "Padgett, M.P.'s." The debate on the Indian Budget—which is always relegated to the latter end of the Session—is a dreary and perfunctory affair, and the benches on both sides of the House of Commons are scantily occupied. Indeed, I only remember one instance during the past twenty years when there was a crowded House to hear a debate

on a subject affecting India, and that was on the day when Sir Henry James moved his resolution about the Cotton Import Duties; and then it was the interests of Lancashire and the fate of the Liberal Government that made members on both sides respond to the summons of the Whips, and not the interests of India.

Now this very instance both explains why India is so neglected, and suggests the remedy. No question will command attention in Parliament until the fate of Governments depend on it, *i.e.*, until it becomes a "party" question; and the constituencies will not take much interest in any question, and certainly will not trouble their representatives about any question, which has not in it the elements of a party fight. It may be a "counsel of perfection" to keep matters of Foreign and Colonial policy and those which affect India clear of party prejudice and heat; but an experience of five and twenty years of active political life has led me to the conclusion that this is only partially possible, and that the effect of it is merely to deprive such matters of the interest and the motive force which party strife has the tendency to create.

I am strengthened in my opinion on this point both by a comparison of the advance made by movements which have been taken up as party questions with those which have been professedly non-party movements, and also by the simple and obvious consideration that reform and progress can and do come only from the efforts of a party, and that the Liberal party.

I hold, therefore, very strongly that if we wish to see the changes and reforms brought about in the civil and military administration of India which have been advocated in this journal, we must get the Liberal party as a whole to adopt them as part of its creed and programme. And as a Liberal I urge that it is the duty of my party to take up these questions, and to strive for reform in the government of India as it has fought for reform in the government of Great Britain, and as it is now pledged to to fight for reform in the government of Ireland. It is consonant with the principles of Liberalism that the demands made by the friends of India in the interests of the people of India should be supported by the party both in Parliament and the country. These demands—which were embodied in the request for a Commission made by Mr. Samuel Smith and others in the late Parliament—ask for an enquiry into the condition and needs of the people of India, their ability to bear the financial burdens which now press upon them so heavily, the nature of the revenue system, the possibility of reductions in civil and military expenditure and in the home charges, and of a readjustment of the financial relations now existing between the Indian and the Home Government. These demands ought to be pressed and supported with the whole strength of the Liberal party in Parliament, and full information with regard to them should be supplied to the constituencies by means of lectures and literature of a popular kind. With all its faults, the English nation loves justice and hates oppression; and if only its eyes were opened to the true state of things in India, it would support the demand for just and necessary reforms in that country as it has done in the case of Ireland. But there is need for a systematic and energetic propaganda, which ought to be undertaken by the great organizations of the party, worked through the local associations and clubs, and supported by speakers and writers who know their subject thoroughly. Lectures illustrated by limelight views and pictures, and small meetings in clubs where a lecture can be easily supplemented by conversational questions and answers, are far more effective than great meetings addressed by five or six prominent speakers. Especially important is it that natives of India who are resident in this country should go about amongst the working classes—as the Irishmen did in the earlier stages of the Home Rule agitation—and familiarize them with the leading facts and features of Indian life, and make them feel that they are not aliens and strangers, but fellow-subjects, as much interested in, as they are entitled to, good government, equal laws, and simple justice. It is the unknown that is always exaggerated, and the majority of Englishmen who oppose even moderate reforms, do so from fear lest any change should be for the worse. If this be the case with matters near home—whether in Great Britain or Ireland—how much more likely is it to be the case with matters so remote as the condition and administration of a distant and—to the bulk of the electors, unknown country like India. It is knowledge that is needed to secure the reforms we advocate; that knowledge can and must be supplied, as political knowledge always has been supplied, by organised work; and that work it is the duty of the Liberal party to do.

LAND REVENUE ASSESSMENT IN MADRAS II.

By Alexander Rogers.
Late of the Bombay Civil Service.

In order to show the feasibility of a practically accurate, although not scientific, system of classification of soils, I now propose to describe that which has been satisfactorily carried out, and is still adopted, in the Bombay Presidency.

In the first place, the determination of whether a soil belongs to a certain order, such as the Madras "ferruginous" or "arenaceous," or the subdivisions of "clay," "loam," or "sand," is not left in the hands of lowly paid classifiers. If there happen to be in the same district two or more classes of soil of clearly varying natural fertility which require different methods of treatment to make them respond equally to the labour of the agriculturalist, the distinction is drawn by the heads of the Settlement department on general considerations. For instance, in the Province of Gujarat there are two visibly different varieties of soil, viz., the *káli*, or black, and the *gorâru*, or white. It is found that the former is naturally more fertile, and requires less labour and less artificial stimulus in the shape of manure, than the latter to place the two on an equal footing for agricultural purposes, and in order to equalise the value of the two, the highest value, 16 annas, in the black is considered equivalent to 14 annas in the

white, the effect being that when a money assessment is imposed, say at a maximum of two rupees an acre, the best black would pay that rate while the best white would be assessed at 1r. 12as. The greater expense of cultivating the white is thus allowed for *ab initio*, and is not left for determination by the classifier. The method, of course, is arbitrary, but it is practically sufficiently accurate to place the two kinds of soil on an equality for the purpose of assessment. The classifiers in a district being thus started on the same path by authority, their further proceedings may be best exemplified by asking the reader to look at his own hand with the fingers stretched out parallel to each other. The middle finger, the longest, is then his 16 anna soil. The third finger, the next in length, having more sand or more gravel or other ingredient which makes it less productive, is put down to 15½ annas. The first finger, the third in length, goes down to 15 annas on account of its containing rather more of the same or other unfertile ingredients. The little finger for similar causes goes down to 14 annas. The thumb, the shortest, goes down to eight, that is, is reckoned as of half the value of the middle finger. The gradations between these severally may be counted on the joints of the fingers, and the reasons for this lowering are recorded in the case of each field by conventional signs, so as to be capable of being tested at any time by the classifier's official superior, generally a European Assistant Superintendent, or the Superintendent himself. In order to ensure equality of work, the whole of the classifiers of an establishment are worked together in the field by one or more superior officers, so that the same standard of lowering classification according to visible faults may be preserved throughout. Thus the value of the soil of every field is referable to that of the best soil in the district under classification, without the distinction of "ferruginous," "arenaceous," "alluvial," etc.

In irrigated lands the classifier has to note down the nature of the water supply, the depth of the water in a well and its level from the surface, its quality (that is, whether it is sweet, or salt, or brackish) and its ordinary duration (that is, whether it fails in the hot weather or not), and the possibility of the supply being supplemented from tanks, wells, etc., all of which particulars are capable of test by his superior officer. The only other duty a classifier has to perform is to mark down against each field its distance from the village site and water, which can be ascertained from the village map, and to take a census of the inhabitants and agricultural stock of the village. It will thus be seen how little real latitude is left in the hands of the classifier and how nearly it can be tested, as it periodically is, by the head of his office.

We now come to the assessment. It will be seen from what has been said above that the duty of the Settling Officer is to determine primarily a maximum rate for each district, the assessment on individual fields following this in a descending scale according to the classification of their soils, the maximum for different groups of villages, subordinate to that for the district as a whole, varying according to the settling officer's judgment with their position with reference to markets and climate. The assessment of individual fields, moreover, varies with reference to their distance from the village sites, those close to villages being probably raised on account of the greater ease with which they can be watched and manured, and those at a distance lowered on account of liability to depredation by wild animals and greater difficulty of manuring, etc. This enables the Settling Officer in his discretion to allow for the general absence of agricultural skill among certain classes over others—as between Kolis and Kunbis in Gujarát, for instance. Such discrimination is perfectly legitimate, but it is not left in the hands of subordinates like the classifiers, and cannot be known or arranged for by them with the cultivators, as it can under the Madras system already explained.

The most critical point for the exercise of the Settling Officer's judgment is the fixing of the maximum rate for a district. The Madras Manual apparently deprecates a reference to former assessments and realizations of revenue for this purpose. Now, to my idea this is the most infallible test of all of the success or otherwise of the revenue administration. If, under it, cultivation and prosperity, as shown by the regular payment of the demands of the State, without recourse to coercive processes such as are apparently the rule and not the exception in Madras, have increased, we may be sure that the assessment has been fair, and property in land has acquired a market value. If, on the contrary, coercive processes have had to be resorted to for the realization of the revenue, and the cultivation of the land has fallen off, the rewards of agriculture have not proved sufficient to induce people to hold on to their lands. In Bombay, in most parts where there is a tolerably dense agricultural population, waste land is hardly obtainable; in Madras there are nearly three and a half million acres of assessed land lying waste. By such considerations, and the probability of a rise or fall in the value of agricultural produce, the Settling Officer must be guided in fixing a maximum rate which, when calculated on the average classification of soils—that is, their ascertained relative fertility, will ensure to the State an equitable revenue, realizable, under the ordinary circumstances of a fair season with an average rainfall, without any general recourse to coercive processes, and offer to the individual cultivator an inducement to hold to his property in the soil, notwithstanding the usual vicissitudes of the seasons. When this is not the case, a cultivator may only find it worth his while to take up land for a season or two, and pay for it as long as the extra fertility it has derived from lying fallow may last, then throwing it up; but in Bombay, where the rates are not rack-rents, but are fixed sufficiently low to leave the cultivator a landlord's profit if he desires to sublet his land or let it lie fallow, no man dares throw up his land for fear of someone else taking it up over his head.

The examination of each village by the Settling Officer inculcated in the Madras Manual points to an assessment fixed in a haphazard way according, to the external appearance of each, without reference to its position with regard to accessibility to markets and the certainty or otherwise of the rainfall. I

have been told that these points are taken into consideration in Madras, and hope they are: otherwise two very important points are omitted. But it is a fact that such consideration is not ordered in the Manual.

One word in conclusion as to the administration of a settlement when made. A great deal of its success or otherwise depends on the proper fixing of the instalments by which the revenue is collected. They should, with a view to keep the rayats out of the hands of unscrupulous money lenders, be fixed from a month to six weeks after the ordinary time for the harvesting of the predominant crops of each village. It would be oppressive to expect the people who harvest the greater part of their produce in February or March to pay an instalment in December, as if their staple crop was rice. I hope I have clearly made out the difference between the Madras and the Bombay systems, but I shall be happy to discuss the subject further with any one disposed to do so.

THE BRITISH EMPIRE LEAGUE.

By J. Dacosta.

A political Association bearing the above name is being formed in London with the proclaimed object of securing the permanent unity of the British Empire, and a circular issued by it in March last appealed for public support on the ground that "the events of the previous few weeks had emphasised the importance of its object." The events thus ominously adverted to were, as it soon afterwards appeared from Mr. Chamberlain's speech at the Canada Club dinner on March 25, the hostile attitude assumed by the United States of America, and the danger it involved to our North American Colonies. The means by which the League proposes to accomplish its object are:

(i) To promote trade between the United Kingdom, the Colonies and India, through periodical meetings of representatives from all parts of the Empire;

(ii) To consider how far laws and treaties might be modified which impede the making of reciprocal trade arrangements;

(iii) To promote closer intercourse by improving the means of communications;

(iv) To develop the principles by which all parts of the Empire may best share in its defence, and devise a more perfect co-operation of the military and naval forces for the protection of the trade routes; and

(v) To assimilate the laws relating to copyrights, legitimacy and bankruptcy throughout the Empire.

These various ends doubtless commend themselves to the nation at large excepting reciprocal trade to which a very large majority is opposed on the ground that it violates the principles of free trade and sanctions the imposition of Custom's duties for political purposes. The League proposes to overcome that opposition through a compromise which would establish free trade between all parts of the Empire, and reciprocal trade in our commerce with foreign countries. The proposed system would thus be simple and intelligible, but for the many exceptions by which it is to be modified, as explained in the following sentences of Mr. Chamberlain's above-mentioned speech:—

"Let us not minimise the proposition we are asked to consider. It would involve in the case of the United Kingdom a most serious disturbance in our trade; it would be a great change in the principles which for many years have guided our commercial policy. It involves the imposition of a duty upon food and upon raw material, and the tendency of imposing such a duty would be to increase the cost of living, which would of course increase the pressure upon the working classes of this country. That cannot be denied, and it would have the tendency to increase the cost of productions, which would put us of course in a worse position than we are now in, in our competition with foreign countries in neutral markets. There is also this startling proposal for a free trade country to consider—one that in its present form it is impossible for us to adopt; not merely because it is contrary to free trade principles; for I am myself a convinced free trader, and believe that the theory is undoubtedly the theory on which the world would become most prosperous; but I have not such a pedantic admiration for it that, if sufficient advantage were offered to me, I would not consider a deviation from the strict doctrine. We cannot admit free trade in spirits or in tobacco or in those articles which, in one part of the Empire or another, are the subject of strictly revenue duties, and might be excluded from the proposed arrangement."

It clearly appears from these statements that the action of the League is to be governed, not by any fixed and acknowledged policy, but by conflicting principles subject to exceptions such as expediency might suggest. Great Britain would no longer be a free trade country, but would at once be drawn, by the exigencies of reciprocal trade, into a war of Customs tariffs with the United States, France and Russia, whence we largely draw our supplies of food and raw material.

In short, as Mr. Chamberlain observed, the proposal involves additional burdens on our working classes and our manufacturing industry, and it withdraws from our colonies the much-valued power they have hitherto exercised of adjusting their Customs tariffs according to their financial necessities, as affected by their respective situations. The task undertaken by the League may, therefore, be arduous and complicated, and their labours might become seriously, if not indefinitely, prolonged.

The proposed meetings of representatives from all parts of the Empire might certainly facilitate agreement on many important points; but even such a result can be expected only if the rules, which are adopted for the selection of the representatives and for the apportionment of their influence over the decisions of the League, are founded upon acknowledged principles of fairness. But nothing has transpired on these all-important points, nor is it known whether a numerical proportion is to be observed between the representatives and the populations whom they are to represent.

In the selection of competent representatives, no great difficulty can arise in the colonies where the representative system of government obtains. But how about India, the largest of our dependencies, and her 250,000,000 of industrious and law-abiding children?

India is governed despotically by a body of officials alien in race, religion, and interests to the people of the country, and acting at the dictation of a Secretary of State in London, who is personally

unacquainted with India and is strongly influenced by the aims of the British Cabinet, which are sometimes diametrically opposed to the interests of the Indian people. Disregarding the dangerous anomalies involved in this combination, the promoters of the League, at their inaugural meeting on January 29, declared:—

"We include the Colonies as fully as the Mother Country, and we include India, which we are glad to know is prosperous and contented."

Now a very moderate acquaintance with India and a glance at the Indian press would suffice to show that India is neither prosperous nor contented.

Popular contentment cannot exist in a community where the administration of justice is tampered with by those who are charged with the protection of the people; and our judicial system in India, which empowers collectors of revenue and other executive officers to preside as judges in Courts of law, is well known to be a most prolific source of injustice and oppression. Government servants are thus allowed to sit in judgment over their own acts. Both Lords Kimberley and Cross have admitted that the system is contrary to good principle, alleging that financial difficulties alone are a bar to reform. It has long been a matter of notoriety that, under the vicious system in question, which violates the first principle of justice, redress for wrongs suffered at the hands of officials in India, is scarcely ever within the reach of the people.

That the assertion that India is prosperous is equally fallacious, will be seen at once, when it is remembered that her finances, ever since the inauguration of the present *régime* in 1858-61, have been in a chronic state of embarrassment. During the early part of that period, a faulty system introduced in connection with the construction of canals and other public works caused many millions to be embarked in unsound speculative enterprises, which failed to yield in every case the financial return which was expected, and, in a great many cases, any financial return at all, while India remained permanently burdened with the debts contracted for defraying the cost of those works. In more recent years her financial embarrassments arose chiefly from the costly wars waged against neighbouring tribal States, on the plea of defending our territories against a Russian invasion, the loans contracted for carrying on those unsuccessful wars having largely increased the public debt of India. Other causes supervened to aggravate the financial situation. The yield of the opium monopoly decreased and became precarious in consequence of the extension of opium cultivation in China. Thereupon the Government sought to retrieve its finances, not by reform and economy, but by increased taxation. The duty on salt has been raised to several hundreds per cent. on the value of that article in bond, and a powerful incentive to smuggling has thereby been afforded, resulting in inquisitorial and oppressive police regulations and in a demoralizing amount of bribery, extortion, and violent crime.

Furthermore the land tax, which, over the greater part of British India, is periodically revised and assessed so as to absorb, in a favourable season, nearly the entire produce of the land, leaves the cultivator, after an indifferent or a bad season, liable for arrears of revenue recoverable from future crops. Under these conditions the agricultural population, except in the limited area where the land tax has been permanently fixed, live in a chronic state of destitution and indebtedness, and perish in hundreds of thousands in the famines which desolate India. The periodical re-assessments of the land tax most effectually discourage the application of capital to the improvement of the soil, by rendering any fruit of the capital so applied liable to be absorbed in the tax at the next revision.

The obvious remedy for this calamitous state of things is the permanent limitation of the Government demand upon land, which would encourage the cultivator to expend capital in the improvement of his farm, and would enable him, after a good harvest, to lay by savings for tiding over seasons of drought or excessive rain. The financial embarrassments of the Government, however, have debarred the adoption of a policy urged alike by reason and justice; and the welfare and contentment of an industrious and intelligent people have been sacrificed to financial exigencies brought about by the mismanagement and extravagance of their rulers.

These deplorable effects of the waste of money in unsound public works and of a mischievous land policy were fereseen by Lord Salisbury, when he was directly connected with the Indian administration. Addressing the Manchester Chamber of Commerce in 1875, his lordship said:—

"My study of the subject of irrigation works has led me to the conviction that the works are not at all what they are represented to be: in most cases they have not answered their purpose and their financial results have been deplorable."

Later, speaking in Bradford in October, 1877, he said:—

"If we expend money rashly upon irrigation works which will not pay and cannot be used by the inhabitants, the interest of that money must be found out of taxes which must in the main be levied upon the peasant; and the end will be that, in order to save him from famine which comes once in twenty years, we would crush him under an increased burden of taxes which comes upon him every year. Depend upon it, the only true remedy against famine and scarcity is the frugality of the people. The people ought in years of plenty to make money enough to lay up for these times of famine."

Between the state of things which prevailed when those warnings were given and the present financial situation in India a direct connection will be found in the following passages of an article on "Indian Affairs" published in the *Times* of April 13, under the heading "The cost of the solvency of India":—

"That solvency has been achieved only by the continuous and heavy additions to the burdens of the people. New taxation to the extent of 60,000,000 rupees has been imposed during the past ten years. This must make all who wish well to *our rule* pause before they congratulate themselves on the result. The Budget statement shows that, between 1884-85 and 1895-96, 23,000,000 rupees has been levied on salt, a necessity of life; and that, during the same period the revenue levied on land has been increased by 43,000,000 rupees. If solvency, therefore, has been attained, it should not be forgotten what it has cost the Indian poor. The statements presented in Parliament in the form of questions to the Secretary of State still remain unanswered. They amount to a charge of fiscal severities in the Madras Presidency which, in a single year, 1893-94, led to the issue of 209,517 notices of sale of property against land-revenue defaulters, and to 14,198 Government tenants being sold up. Lord George Hamilton stated that the

Indian Government had been instructed to report on the matter. Yet we cannot forget that several years have elapsed since the question was raised, and that some years have also passed since the Government of Madras was directed to submit an explanation. Outstanding charges of this sort create an uneasiness as to what the progress of Indian measures really means to the people, and as to the measures by which Indian solvency has been attained."

To revert now to the British Empire League, it was announced at its inaugural meeting that the Duke of Devonshire had accepted the position of its President. An impression prevails, however, that *Reciprocal trade* (involving as it does the imposition of protective duties on the products of any country where similar duties are levied on British products) is repugnant to his Grace's views of commercial policy. It will be remembered also that Lord Salisbury, in replying to Lord Stanley of Alderley on the question of protective duties, said on February 24: "I conclude by reiterating my assertion that nothing that I have said can fairly be construed as an argument in favour of Protection." On the other hand the Duke of Devonshire is known to be well informed on the main features of our Indian administration. It may therefore reasonably be expected that the removal of the blots which disfigure that administration, will commend itself to his Grace as a step better calculated to promote the welfare, affirm the loyalty and strengthen the attachment of our Indian fellow-subjects to British rule, than the indirect means which are suggested in the programme of the League.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

HOW DISCUSSION IS STIFLED.

WHAT INDIAN CRITICS THINK.

A WARNING FOR OFFICIAL OPTIMISTS.

The Indian Budget—or, as it is officially termed, the Financial Statement, 1896-7—was introduced and explained by Sir James Westland in the Viceroy's Legislative Council on Thursday, March 19th. On the following Thursday, March 26th, the Council met again, and a portion of the sitting was devoted to discussion of the Budget. After disposing of it and some other business, the Council adjourned *sine die*.

That is to say, the Indian Budget, dealing as it does with an expenditure of well over a thousand millions of rupees, is dismissed in India at a single sitting, without amendment and without a division. Not only have the taxpayers of India no voice in determining the amount or the nature of the expenditure, but even the non-official members of the Council itself are debarred from putting a single question to the vote, or protesting effectively against a single proposal. They can only deliver a solitary speech upon the Budget as a whole, and their speeches, boycotted by the Anglo-Indian journals, are but voices crying in the wilderness.

The attention which the representatives of the Indian taxpayers receive at the hands of the Finance Minister may be judged from a single example. In the absurdly perfunctory discussion of March 26th—the only discussion which will take place upon the Budget—Sir James Westland described one of his most competent critics as "a gentleman on the Bombay side who is under the delusion that he knows something about Indian finance, and has been making occasional attempts to induce the public to share his hallucination."

In due course, the Indian Budget will be considered in the House of Commons. In other words, a handful of members of Parliament, at the fag-end of the Session, will be invited to register the foregone conclusions which have been graciously laid before the Viceroy's Council. The House of Commons will merely be asked to declare that it appears from the accounts that the total revenue of India *for the year ending a year ago last March* was so-and-so, and the expenditure so-and-so. No effective division will be possible, and the opinions expressed by independent Indian critics will not be laid before Parliament.

It may be doubted whether human ingenuity could contrive a system more perfectly designed to preserve irresponsible power in the hands of those who call the tune, and to keep out of sight and out of mind the wants and wishes of those who pay the piper. Sir Henry Fowler is not a humourist. But he has perpetrated the grim sarcasm that all members of Parliament are members for India.

In these circumstances—circumstances which find their natural counterpart in the growing discontent of the Indian people, and the bitter despair of many of India's most able sons—it is of the highest importance to convey to the British public some notion, however inadequate, of the criticisms passed by Indians upon the expenditure which they only provide and are not permitted to control. We propose, therefore, to bring together a series of extracts from speeches delivered in the Legislative Council, and articles published in the Indian journals—premising, however, that the Indian Budget only touches the surface of Indian problems, which belong not to book-keeping but to policy.

THE FAMINE INSURANCE FUND.

Sir James Westland began his Financial Statement with the announcement that the Famine Insurance Fund (so long neglected for military aggression and compensation to officials) was to be restored. He had the assurance to describe the Government's obligation in respect to this Fund as "self-imposed." In the same spirit he stated that the Government would "meet all the necessary obligations" if they set aside, not 1½ millions sterling per annum, as originally agreed, but Rx. 1,000,000. The words in inverted commas appear in paragraphs 3 and 6. But in paragraph 75 Sir James Westland, with greater candour, describes the Government's present proposal as "the *partial* restoration of the famine grant." A considerable part of Mr. Ananda Charlu's speech was naturally taken up with this question. In the course of his speech, he said:

"I do not see why it is called a self-imposed obligation. It is, I believe, an obligation compulsorily thrust on the Government by the necessities and conditions inseparable from the administration of a country subject to repeated recurrences of famine, almost as a matter of course. If so, it is like all other obligations which are forced upon the Government by causes extraneous to its mere will and pleasure. If this has been

specialised as self-imposed in order to facilitate its suspension in the future, as has too often been done in the past, I must strongly object to it as the introduction of the thin end of the wedge to indicate an unsympathetic and radical change of policy."

Mr. Ananda Charlu then traced, as we have more than once traced in India, the origin and history of the Famine Insurance Fund. We need only cite again the words used by Lord Lytton when fears were expressed on behalf of the people of India that, although special taxation was imposed to provide for the Famine Insurance Fund, the money so raised might not always be employed for that purpose. Lord Lytton said:

"I think I am entitled to point out to the Council that we are not now open to this customary criticism. We do not speak without having acted; and we promised nothing which we have not, after long and anxious consideration, provided ourselves with the means of performing. I must have very imperfectly explained myself thus far, if I have failed to make it clearly understood that I am not now speaking of what we ought to do, or would do, to insure this country against the worst effects of future famine, had we only the means of doing it; but of what we can do, and will do, with the means already provided for with the means now before the Council. I do not mean to say that the construction of such an extensive system of local railroads and irrigation works as we propose to undertake will not be the gradual task of many years. But I do mean to say that, in the manner and on the principle already explained, we are now providing for the prompt commencement and uninterrupted continuation of this great and necessary task. As the representative of the Sovereign of India, I regret that such language should have been held to me by you. The sole purpose of the taxation you complain of was the preservation of the lives of the people of India from the effects of famine. Whatever may be the faults or shortcomings of this Government, its action in the matter to which your address makes reference was dictated by the sincerest and most anxious desire to give the people of India the greatest protection which could practically be provided for them against the calamities of future famine. To insinuate the contrary is to insinuate a calumny."

Promise and —— Performance.

Mr. Ananda Charlu proceeded to quote in Lord Lytton's own words the undertakings into which the Government of India entered when the Fund was started and the special taxation imposed. The first and essential undertaking was to apply funds "at the rate of 1½ millions sterling per annum in such a manner as to create what shall be, in fact, an Insurance Fund, from which future expenditure for famine relief can be provided for without adding to the permanent burdens on the revenue." Placing these undertakings side by side with Sir James Westland's statement, Mr. Ananda Charlu said:—

"One cannot help reading between the lines, and noting, with profound sorrow, an ill-concealed disposition to starve this Fund in order to meet the cost of measures which are more or less dictated by the general obligation the Government is under to meet commercial or strategic needs and to develop the resources of the country, and which it is bound to undertake for their own sakes and quite apart from any relation to famines. These, for purposes of distinction and easy reference, I shall call non-famine Public Works, including both large irrigation measures and railway constructions. The phrase, 'measure calculated to prevent the recurrence of famine,' and the phrase, 'to facilitate measures of relief on its occurrence,' which are used by the hon. Finance Minister, are far too elastic and far too vague. Given a certain amount of skill and ingenuity, I do not know what measures could not be easily lugged into these categories, irrespective of all specifications in the past. Every railway construction, by affording easy transit for food grains, and every work of irrigation, by serving the same purpose and rendering the further service of watering more extended areas of cultivated land, must to some extent help to check famine, and might any day be declared to come under the latter of these words. What is the permanent differentia? Is it to be the will and pleasure of the holders of the portfolio for the time being?"

Chitral and the "Forward" Policy.

Sir James Westland's references to the Chitral expedition were frequent and significant. His answer to the financial optimism of Lord G. Hamilton and Mr. Balfour is (para. 11) that:

"The Chitral expedition has cost us Rx.67,200 in the accounts of 1894-5, Rx.1,647,500 in the revised estimate 1895-6, and a further sum of Rx.20,000 will come under payment in 1896-7, giving a total of Rx.1,734,700 in India, besides a sterling expenditure in replacement of stores of £16,000. *It has left us a legacy of permanent expenditure in the occupation of Chitral and of its communications* which has involved in 1895-6 an expenditure of Rx.102,200, and will involve in 1896-7 an expenditure of Rx.231,700. . . . . The financial statement is not the place in which to defend the policy of the expedition or the occupation which has followed it; and I have here merely to note the fact that against a Budget provision of Rx.150,000, which was announced as intended to meet the cost of preparation which it was hoped might not eventuate in war, we have expended Rx.1,749,700 plus £16,000, being an excess, omitting exchange, of Rx.1,615,700."

Sir James Westland adds, in a footnote, that these figures do not include "political" expenditure. Mr. Ananda Charlu agreed that the financial statement was not the place in which to defend the policy of the expedition:

"I say, with greater propriety of language, that it is not of any avail (and therefore not fitting) that it should be discussed in this Council. But one single remark has, however, to be made in this connection, viz., that, owing to the accident of a recent change of Ministry in Great Britain five untoward results to India have ensued, viz.:

(1) The disappearance of a good slice of her previous income.
(2) The permanent addition to her already over-burdened expenditure by reason of retaining Chitral.
(3) The postponement of performance of a long-standing and deliberate promise to relieve her suffering poor by a reduction of the salt-tax.
(4) A fresh burden in the shape of taxation on the coarser goods which alone are available to the poor in the land; and
(5) A burden of 15 lakhs a year in the shape of interest on the loan of four crores that has been announced to be in immediate contemplation."

Again, at the close of his speech, Mr. Ananda Charlu added:

"Within these ten years this forward policy has cost us—apart from the wars themselves—an aggregate sum of nearly seventy crores, and has added to our permanent expenditure no less a sum than six crores per annum; and as for the Home Charges they have mounted up to over twenty-five crores of rupees. It is to meet drains such as these that the poor man's food and salt are reduced to famine rations and the hand of the tax-gatherer is laid even on his coarse and scanty raiment. This has been said, and said times out of number. The non-officials have said it, and they have been laughed at for their pains. But two predecessors of the Finance Minister of to-day have also said it with a full knowledge of the arcana of Indian finance. They have, with the trammels of office, thrown away the dead weight of reticence which sat heavily on their conscience while they held the official portfolio. They have discharged their conscience by boldly denouncing these as the true enemies of India. They too have been relegated to the limbo of disdain and scorn. This is the most unspeakable of India's misfortunes."

THE ONE ALTERNATIVE—RETRENCHMENT.

We have not the space to do justice to the cogent criticisms which Ananda Charlu passed upon the remaining portions of the Budget. Sir James Westland's surplus is admittedly a windfall, the result of unexpected improvement in exchange. Indian critics are unanimous in calling attention to the instability of this foundation. Mr. Ananda Charlu's words were:

"This Budget is, indeed, an admirable feat. I can only describe it as an inverted cone, with its apex in the shifting sands of Exchange, with all the weight of this year's Indian prosperity mainly posed on that apex. That unstable foundation might any day discover sudden signs of giving way; and to prop up our inverted cone we might have to seize upon everything ready to hand, even to the extent of further straitening the poor man's food and clothing and his small savings. It behoves us, therefore, to see how to rehabilitate our Revenue and to place it on a sound, firm, and solid basis. There is but one alternative, and it is but to have the word Retrenchment largely writ and put in practice measures tending towards it. A mere cheeseparing policy will never do. The insatiate and never-ceasing demands of our Forward Policy must be attacked and overcome. Our ever-growing Home Charges must be considerably beaten down. If these are impracticable, then the sole remedy is for Great Britain to come out with a substantial contribution to alleviate India's burden."

SHEARING THE PROVINCIAL SHEEP.

Another matter to which Mr. Ananda Charlu referred was the policy of the Central Government in its dealings with the Provincial Governments. Paragraphs 60—64 of Sir James Westland's statement discussed this subject in a spirit which has caused natural anxiety throughout India. "It is," according to Sir James Westland, "curious that nearly every Province in India assumes that it is the possessor of a large surplus of revenue, and that only the necessity of maintaining the expenditure of other and poorer Provinces, or something which is vaguely termed 'Imperial necessities,' prevents its enjoying the full benefits of its own revenues." This "notion" Sir James Westland promised to "dissipate." Sir James Westland added that his statement upon this matter would serve as a "useful preliminary to the discussion of the assignments" he might find himself able to make in the new provincial contracts. This threat—for it was nothing else—drew down upon him the remonstrances not only of the Indian members of the Council but also of Sir A. Mackenzie, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. Sir A. Mackenzie complained that, Sir J. Westland's theories notwithstanding, the Supreme Government did not always realise that it had as great a responsibility for local administration as the local Government itself. Sir A. Mackenzie added:—

"I have seen, or seemed to see, a tendency on the part of that Government to wash its hands of this responsibility, especially as regards finance. I thought I saw this when, as Chief Commissioner of Burma, I protested vigorously against the mulct of 18 lakhs taken from that province in 1894-95, and which I am glad to see now given back. I know that my hon. friend will repudiate the idea, but I have, I believe, none the less seen it elsewhere also in operation, conscious or unconscious. I refer to it, however, now not by way of complaint about the past, but in order to enter a *caveat* in view of the revision of the Provincial contracts to which the hon. member alludes in his para. 64. I trust that he will enter upon this revision in full consciousness of the fact that the Imperial Government is as much interested in the development and improvement of Provincial Administration as the Provincial Governments themselves, and that any check inflicted on them is a check to the whole Imperial machine. I must say I deprecate the way in which these quenquennial reversions have too frequently been carried out. The Provincial sheep is summarily thrown on its back, close clipped and shorn of its wool, and turned out to shiver till its fleece grows again. The nominal history of a provincial contract is this: two years of screwing and saving and postponement of works, two years of resumed energy on a normal scale, and one year of dissipation of balances in the fear that, if not spent, they will be annexed by the Supreme Government at the time of revision. Now all this is wrong, not to say demoralising. I say that the Supreme Government ought not to steer too closely each quinquennium. It is as much interested in the continuity of work as the local governments, and ought to endeavour to secure this and avoid extreme *bouleversements* of the Provincial finances. In the first two Provincial contracts India left Bengal not only its accumulated balance but part of its normal and recurring surplus. In the last three contracts it has taken the whole normal surplus, leaving Bengal to create a new surplus and make what it could out of the progressive growth of its revenues. This necessarily inflicts on the province at least two years of leanness at the outset of each quinquennium. It would be an immense gain to local administrations if the Government of India could see its way to renewing the contracts with as little change as practicable on each occasion. It is only in this way that the element of fiscal certainty, which was put forward in 1870 as one of the main objects of its decentralisation, can be secured."

WANTED: REMISSION OF TAXATION.

Mr. Bhuskate, another Indian member of the Council, joined in the attack upon the policy by which the contribution to the Famine Fund is to be reduced to one crore, and criticised the financial relations between the Supreme and the Provincial Governments. The rest of his speech is summarised as follows:

"He argued that the poorer provinces were made to contribute more than their proper share, in order that the richer provinces might not be taxed their full share of the Imperial contribution. He advocated the remission of the heavy additional taxation imposed during the past few years to meet the financial crisis. Relief should, in the first place, be given to the mass of the population. Speaking of the expenditure he referred to the great increase of military charges since 1885, which were wrongly attributed to the fall in exchange. Railways, too, he said had been built with little regard for cost. In this year's Budget the protective railways constituted the most important head of expenditure and most of them were constructed for protecting the North-Western frontier. The vigorous prosecution of railway construction had already largely added to the net loss to the State during the previous years. He also criticised the special grant for the mobilisation."

SUPREME DISREGARD OF POPULAR DEMANDS.

We turn from the speeches to the newspapers—though it is impossible within our limits of space to give more than a glimpse of the criticisms which pervade the journals of educated India. The *Indu-Prakash*, one of the most sober and thoughtful of Indian journals, published a long article criticising the Budget, point by point. "That the surpluses were not expected, and consequently no provision was made for lightening the burdens on the poor; that there was none in the Supreme Legislative Council to find the flaws in the Budget; that none of the members cared to discuss a policy which has often been discussed without profit; that the Government of India, in spite of a surplus, would not think of taking a general view of their position which is as essential in times of trouble as in times of prosperity; that Sir James Westland merely acts as an

Accountant General and not as a Finance Minister intent on putting the Indian finance on a firmer basis; these matters will not be considered satisfactory by anyone except the Government of India and its financial adviser. By the rest of the civilised world they will be taken to indicate a supreme disregard on the part of the ruling authorities towards the wants and wishes of the subject races." On the subject of Famine Insurance Fund the *Indu-Prakash* said:—

"We are bound in justice to Sir James Westland to say that he has done one act of grace, though it is a partial one, by restoring the Famine and Insurance grant and charging it on the revenues. Thus in the accounts of 1894-95 and 1895-96 the grant again appears to the amount of a crore of rupees, most of it being charged partly under the Famine Relief and Insurance and partly under the Railway Revenue Account. When the Government took upon itself the obligation of setting apart every year £1,500,000 it levied the assessed taxes to meet the obligation. The Government, therefore, is bound at least to spend the whole amount it has received from the assessed taxes, if not £1,500,000 a year, on objects for which the fund was originally intended. But the Government has not met its obligations fully. Instead of continuing to fulfil its duty—for the Famine Insurance Fund is in the nature of a trust—the Government have actually cut down the annual grant by fully one-third, if we take the amount fixed originally to be in rupees, and by nearly a-half if we take the amount, as in fact it was, to be originally fixed in pounds sterling. This reduction of the grant, which Sir James wants the Government to make a permanent one, is not at all justifiable, considering the history of the measure and the state of the country."

THE LAND REVENUE: A "RELENTLESSLY EXACTING" SYSTEM.

In the opinion of the *Indu-Prakash* one of the chief blots on the picture drawn by Sir J. Westland is the Land Revenue:

"Apart from the question of rack-rent, it seems as if the revenue to be derived from land has reached its maximum limit. The bad seasons and famines, now in one district and then in another, whether called by their real name or not, tell their own tale. In spite of the highly scientific and relentlessly exacting system of collecting land revenue, the estimated income is not realised. In the Central Provinces, for instance, the Finance Minister does not expect, in spite of an increase of Rs. 4,75,000 owing to revised assessments, the probable collections for the next year to come up even to the Budget estimates of this year."

THE HUGE MONSTER OF MILITARY EXPENDITURE.

Finally, the *Indu-Prakash* discusses with something like the resignation of despair the appalling burden of military expenditure:

"Of late it has grown without bounds, and one cannot tell when it will remain stationary. With the military party in the ascendant both in England and India, our poor country is fated to be crushed by the huge and heavy monster of military expenditure. Nearly the whole yield from the land revenue is to be spent on him, and still he seems to be as hungry as ever. This year it is the Chitral expedition which swells the bill. It is well to bring out here a fact which is worth noting. Lord George Hamilton during the first debate on Chitral glibly mentioned that the occupation of Chitral would not cost India additional expense. Mr. Balfour, too, said the same or similar thing. If they said this thing under instruction, we must blame the India Office; if they said it on their own authority we must charge them with a wanton negligence of their duty as ministers of Her Majesty the Queen. In any case, it is interesting to note that, apart from the expenditure incurred in connexion with the Chitral expedition, amounting to more than one crore and seventy-five lakhs of rupees. the occupation of Chitral and its communications will cost, under Army, Rs. 10,22,000 this year and Rs. 23,17,000 next year. 'The occupation also involves'—we are quoting the very words of the Finance Minister—'additional expenditure under other heads of the estimates.'"

"THE MILITARY DESPOTISM WHICH PREVAILS IN INDIA."

The same note is to be found in all quarters of the Indian press. The blots to which the *Indu-Prakash* directs attention receive universal notice, and the reader is left with a profound sense of the monotonous, despairing cry which educated India raises in vain against the policy of her bureaucratic rulers. We may conclude with two further extracts upon the vital question of military expenditure. "The Chitral expedition," writes the *Bengalee*,

"was estimated to cost only 15 lakhs of rupees. It has cost, as now appears from the Financial Statement, a crore and 75 lakhs of rupees. Is it so very unlikely that we may have another expedition like the one for which we had to pay a little bill of nearly 2 crores of rupees? It is difficult to anticipate what may or may not happen on the frontiers. Expeditions beyond the frontiers represent the normal order of things. As the Government has to provide for its ordinary Civil and Military establishment, it may in the same manner set apart a certain sum of money—a million or two—on the expenditure side for our ever-recurring frontier expeditions. What will become of the small surplus balance of 50 lakhs of rupees, if there is to be another Chitral expedition? What will become of this surplus balance, if there is to be a sudden and unexpected fall in the exchange? The surplus will then be converted into a deficit, and another year of deficit will be added to the long category of such years. As in previous years, so also now, military charges loom largely on the view. They absorb our revenues, impoverish our people, demoralize our Government and accentuate the military despotism which prevails in India, and which, if English rule is to be permanent, must be replaced by a more popular form of Government.

"THIS LAMENTABLE WASTE OF MONEY."

Similarly the *Hindu* points out that the Chitral expedition has, of course, cost a great deal more than the Government at first anticipated, or were willing to avow to the public:—

"In the Budget of last year Sir James Westland provided the ridiculously small amount of Rx. 150,000, and had the vain hope that the preparations that were being made might not eventuate in war. But not only did war actually happen, but it has cost much more than Lord Elgin and his Councillors had at first an idea of. The expedition cost Rx. 67,200 in the accounts of 1894-95, Rx. 1,647,500 in the Revised Estimate of 1895-96, besides a further sum of Rx. 20,000 which will come under payment in 1896-97, making a total of Rx. 1,734,700 in India, besides a sterling expenditure in replacement of stores of £16,000. This is the cost of the expedition; but the permanent occupation 'has left us a legacy of permanent expenditure' which amounted in 1895-96 to Rx. 102,200, and which will involve in 1896-97 an expenditure of Rx. 231,700. Sir James Westland did not give us all the particulars of the expenditure already incurred, or of the annual expenditure in future years. But the figures given show that for the luxury of watching the internecine civil struggle of barbarous chieftains the taxpayers of India have had to pay for the expedition nearly two crores of rupees, besides a number of lives lost and the amount of suffering inflicted, and will have, in addition, to pay so much as 25 lakhs of rupees every year in future. It is impossible that the Government of India in this country or in England can justify to posterity this lamentable waste of money at a time when the public finances were in a state of the acutest crisis."

We only hope that members of Parliament and others will pay heed to these warning voices, which were never more urgently needed than now to correct the optimism of the India Office and the Government of India.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of India cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to India (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with India, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of India can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., Trinity Street, Cambridge; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

India presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, MAY, 1896.

REACTIONARY ENTERPRISES—AND AFTER.

It is an ominous fact that the Government of India is exhibiting a disposition to introduce measures of a reactionary character which, even though they be regarded in the most favourable light, must produce a *maximum* amount of irritation with the possibility of securing a *minimum* amount of good. The recent Bill, now greatly modified, for the Amendment of the Legal Practitioners Act, furnished an instructive example of this unfortunate tendency. If the object of the Bill was to suppress "touting" altogether, the Government was undertaking a hopeless task. No legislation will succeed in removing an evil which requires remedies of a totally different nature. Respectable members of the Bar—and they are probably the majority—are unanimous in condemning "touts" as well as those members of their own profession who, deliberately or through carelessness, make it possible for "touts" to obtain a living. Perhaps the honest legal practitioner is a greater sufferer from the iniquitous system of *dalali* than the suitor who falls into the "tout's" clutches. The honest pleader is deprived of work which would otherwise have fallen to his share. The suitor, no doubt, sometimes falls through sheer ignorance a victim to the harpies who infest the Courts, but just as often with his eyes open he entrusts himself and his case to a person who, as he knows, has no legal *status*, with the sole purpose of saving a few rupees. To protect even such suitors against persons who, are not scrupulous in their dealings is no doubt a praiseworthy act, and such provisions of the Bill as had this object were accepted without demur by the legal profession in India, and by the public at large. But there was no justification for another provision in the Bill which would practically have degraded and punished the honest practitioner for the misdeeds of the offending "hanger-on." The law as it now stands is probably stringent enough against the erring pleader. If he be convicted of giving brokerage or commission to a "tout," he can be sentenced to a term of six months' imprisonment, apart from the disciplinary punishment of having his name struck off the rolls. In Western countries misconduct on the part of an attorney or solicitor is rarely visited with such condign punishment. Perhaps it is this fact which influences the Judges of the High Courts, who have never yet, in a single case, imprisoned an offending pleader. What then were the purposes for which the Government of India recently attempted to lower the *status* of legal practitioners by making them answerable to district judges and commissioners for alleged acts of misconduct? Hitherto, though legal practitioners might be temporarily suspended by the district judges, the High Courts alone were empowered to adjudicate on their cases and inflict punishment on them.

There are two purposes which underlie the Government's reactionary measure, though they found no place in the statement of objects and reasons which accompanied the Bill. In a large number of cases pleaders had been suspended by district judges and reported to the High Court as unfit to practice at the Bar, but in all except a few instances the High Courts refused to accept the recommendations of the district judges, and either acquitted the pleaders or inflicted a nominal punishment on them. The proposed measure was, therefore, directed in some sort against the judges of the High Court, with the object of diminishing their power and transferring it to the subordinate courts. In the first instance, it is true, the Calcutta High Court acquiesced in the proposed change. But after mature reflection it changed its views, and, through its Registrar, wrote the following letter to the Government of India:—

> "As regards Sections 2 and 4 of the Bill, I am to say that on further consideration, and having regard to the stringent character of the proposed legislation, the judges have decided to withdraw for the present the recommendation contained in their previous letter, that Sec. 14 of the Act should be so amended as to enable the district or sessions judges, or chief controlling revenue authority to whom the proceedings of subordinate courts are to be submitted, to suspend or dismiss the pleader or *mukhtar*, subject to an appeal to the High Court. They think that the provisions inserted in the Bill in accordance with that recommendation should be abandoned, and that no change should be made in the existing law in this respect."

The other purpose which may on good grounds be assigned to the measure arose from the fact that pleaders and *mukhtars* show a degree of independence which is not always relished by the executive authorities. Not only do they freely criticise the Government in their public utterances, and lead public opinion in agitating for reforms which are not acceptable to the Government, but in municipalities and district boards they cannot be easily

controlled by the district magistrates, and sometimes prove troublesome when the executive authorities are desirous of pushing through a reactionary measure. It would, of course, have been an easy solution of this difficulty to place the men who dared to think for themselves under the control of district judges and commissioners, who might have made short work of troublesome individuals.

That such a retrograde measure should have provoked a storm of indignation and given rise to criticism which was as unfavourable as it was unanimous is not to be wondered at. The objections raised against it were as varied as they were unanswerable, and may be summarised as follows :—

(*a*) The Bill, in its original form, would have lowered the position of legal practitioners, and, by degrading them, have aggravated the evils which it was intended to remove. The Government of India professed to be actuated by a desire to elevate the position of pleaders and *mukhtars*. It would surely have been a very curious way of attaining this end, to degrade them in the estimation of others.

(*b*) It was not necessary to subject pleaders to the proposed indignity in order to suppress "touting." No reasonable person could object to the punishment of "touts," and of legal practitioners who encourage "touting." But how depriving the members of the Bar of their privilege of being tried by the High Court would have tended to put down "touting," no one ventured to explain.

(*c*) It is most desirable in the interests of justice that legal practioners should fearlessly discharge their duties. In the Mofussil, where there is an utter absence of public opinion, and judges and magistrates are disposed unduly to assert their position, this is not an easy task. To have made pleaders subservient to district judges and commissioners would have been a heavy blow to the administration of justice. Could it be expected that a legal practitioner under the proposed law would be able as freely to cross-examine witnesses, or as fully and fairly to argue a case in which the judge had formed an opinion against his client, when he knew that the same judge might humiliate or punish him for any alleged misconduct? Knowing what we do of human nature we may reasonably conclude what line of conduct the pleader or *mukhtar* would have been likely to adopt.

(*d*) The proposed clause not only struck a blow at the legal practitioner, but at the public generally. If passed it would have deprived suitors in the Mofussil Courts of the privilege of engaging men who would fearlessly and honestly discharge their duties, and who would have in view solely the interests of their clients.

(*e*) Experience has shown that in something like 75 per cent. of the cases, the High Courts have disagreed with the district judges in the reports they have sent up against legal practitioners. The new Bill proposed, therefore, to place these men at the mercy of the judges who had been found unequal to the task of weighing the evidence or appreciating the gravity of an offence alleged to have been committed. That some of these judges had so failed is not surprising, for though some of them are men of ripe judgment and experience, others have been transferred to the Bench from the executive service and cannot show more than seven or eight years' service altogether. It often happens that such judges carry their executive bias with them, or from want of experience commit serious mistakes. The Government scarcely displayed a great degree of statemanship when it proposed to transfer jurisdiction in a class of difficult and often intricate cases from the High Courts to subordinate and less experienced Courts. It is, therefore, with extreme satisfaction that the public learned that some of the most objectionable clauses in the Bill were to be withdrawn at the instance of the Select Committee appointed to report upon it, and that the Bill would be thoroughly recast. Sir Alexander Miller, speaking in the Legislative Council on March 12th, said: "When I presented this report a week ago I stated that the Select Committee had made very extensive alterations in the Bill as originally presented—alterations which really amounted to a recasting of the Bill." And even the *Englishman*, on March 18th, commenting on the measure in its new and revised form, wrote :

> "It is admitted that grave abuses prevail, but not grave enough to justify the introduction of a system which would in many cases result in depriving ignorant litigants of professional assistance altogether, while it would only reach the evil of touting on those comparatively rare occasions when the tout proved more a fool than a rogue. The original proposals gave ample opportunities for the gratification of personal animosity, seeing that the practice of a pleader was made to depend upon the individual discretion of the officer presiding over a local court. A single delator might persuade the judge of the guilt of any practitioner, who would forthwith find his occupation gone."

The recent attempts at reactionary legislation have thus proved abortive. But they teach us, nevertheless, more than one lesson. They seem to disclose a certain disposition on the part of the executive authorities in India to pay scant regard (we use no harsher phrase) to the privileges of the people. With the avowed intention of improving the administration of justice they proposed a measure which involved the pratical abolition of trial by jury, and with the avowed intention of raising the *status* of the Bar, they proposed a measure which would have degraded legal practitioners and made them subservient to the official classes. It is most necessary, therefore, that we should be on our guard for the future and carefully weigh the effects of any legislation which may be proposed by the Government of India. Another inference from recent events is that the Government has begun to recognise the existence of public opinion in India, and the expediency of sometimes giving way to it. It was in this spirit that it surrendered the objectionable clauses in the Jury Bill and in the Legal Practitioners Bill. If with a united voice the people of India declare their opinions, and calmly and persistently press their claim to be heard, it will be a difficult task for the Government to ignore them. It is, moreover, by no means an unsatisfactory feature of these attempts of the Government of India at reactionary legislation that they have caused non-official Europeans in India to make common cause with the Indians. Sir Griffith Evans, who is understood to be in high favour with the Government of

India, was a member of the Select Committee in the case of both measures, and in both cases took the popular view. With reference to the cotton duties it was noticed with satisfaction that Europeans and Indians combined together to protest against the action of the Government of India. May we not hope that non-official Europeans are beginning to see that it would often be more to their advantage to make common cause with the people of India for the promotion of the common welfare of all?

POLITICAL SCIENCE.[1]

THERE is a story of a thrifty labouring man who, as the fruit of his savings, gradually acquired a homestead of his own with a garden, and afterwards a field and a pond, and ducks to inhabit the pond. Then, as his savings still accumulated, he invested pounds not a few in a steamship company. But after a short period of prosperity and handsome dividends there came a day when the company paid nothing to its shareholders, perhaps even made a call upon them. He returned home from the half-yearly meeting dejected and morose. When he took up his gun and slouched out of the house without saying a word, his wife's fears were aroused. She followed him, and found him standing by the pond, taking aim at the ducks and killing them one by one. It was in vain that she tried to dissuade him. "You let me alone, Jemima Jane," he answered her stubbornly. "I'm sick of it all. *No "more floating property for me!"*

To append a moral to a story is to go some way towards spoiling it. But as it would hardly have been permissible to tell the story here without some ulterior purpose, the reader will pardon the moral for the sake of the story, and, after a sufficient interval, proceed to the grave consideration of the moral itself. More morals than one are possible. The ethical philosopher might point out, if he were an utilitarian, the futility of the revenge; if an altruist, the injustice to the ducks. But our concern is rather with the standpoint of the logician, who would show that the labourer was led into his useless act of destruction by a false analogy, or by making a faulty classification based on unessential resemblances. The object of Political Science is to save us from similar errors in a higher sphere, where they are less ludicrous but more common and equally disastrous. For many of the current classifications on which men base their judgments in history and politics have little more to recommend them than the superficial classification which condemned the ducks to an untimely end because they belonged, like the unprofitable steamers, to the unlucky category of "floating property." When we divide states into monarchies, aristocracies, and democracies; when we follow the ancients in contrasting the government of the one and the government of the many; when we sharply distinguish the unitary state from the federation; when, lastly, we exalt the state that enjoys "liberty" and bemoan the state that lacks it—are we sure, in all these cases, that we know exactly what we mean or that we are expressing a really important distinction? "Realise "your ideas," one of the best of Oxford teachers, the late Mr. R. L. Nettleship, was never weary of repeating. It would be difficult to name a maxim more useful whether in philosophy, in literary criticism, in history or in politics. What a mass of pretentious writing in all these subjects dwindles away the moment the simple test is applied! "Realise your ideas; bring your abstracts to con-"cretes; define your terms." The student who wishes to be helped to carry out this golden rule of all clear thinking for himself could hardly have better guidance than is afforded by the two courses of lectures on Political Science delivered at Cambridge in 1885-6 by the late Professor Seeley, and now published by Messrs. Macmillan in their Eversley series. What Professor Seeley called "the con-"fusion of thought in which we cheerfully and "good-naturedly live" is well illustrated by our careless use of "that blessed word" (as the old lady reverently said of the word "Mesopotamia" in her Bible)—"that blessed word," *Liberty.* Originally it was not a political term, expressing a relation between the citizen and the Government, but a legal term, expressing the *status* of the citizen as compared with others who were non-citizens. The *status* of the slave does not exist in modern Europe, and so "our liberty is a metaphor "which has been, as it were, cut adrift; it expresses "a resemblance, an analogy, which we can never test, "because the phenomenon to which it points is entirely "unknown to us" (p. 110). In his sixth lecture, Professor Seeley distinguishes three different senses in which the word "liberty" is popularly used. First, as when we say the Greeks fought for "liberty" at Marathon, it stands for national independence. Secondly, in the classical stories of tyrannicide, and in the history of the English constitutional struggles of the seventeenth century, it stands for responsibility of government. Thirdly—and this is a use seldom distinguished from the second, yet needing to be kept quite distinct—it stands for a limitation of the province of government. In this third sense, which Professor Seeley regards as the most useful in political science, liberty is a good or a bad thing according to circumstances. Complete liberty would mean utter anarchy; but as nations have often suffered from an excess of government, liberty in the sense of restricted government (apart from the attractive associations of the other uses of the word) seems to us desirable. Yet it is important for the historical student to understand "the relativeness of "political truth" (p. 137). Professor Seeley does not shrink from the paradox that even religious intolerance "was, in its own time and place, not "absolutely condemnable": toleration, introduced prematurely into ground not prepared to receive it, would have acted as a solvent to the state to which it was applied. Nor must nations and governments be looked at without regard to their foreign environment; the pressure of external enemies is often the best justification of repressive measures within. "The old restrictive legislation seems to be com-

[1] "Introduction to Political Science." Two Series of Lectures. By Sir J. R. Seeley, K.C.M.G., Litt.D. London: Macmillan and Co. 1896.

"monly assumed to have been always utterly inde-"fensible. This kind of dogmatism in politics I do "not understand" (p. 136).

Another word that has been "soiled by all ignoble "use" is *Aristocracy*. It means properly, of course, "the government of the best," and is expressly contrasted by Aristotle with "oligarchy" as existing for the good of the governed and for no narrow and selfish ends; but partly because it constantly tends to degenerate into oligarchy, partly because oligarchy persistently usurps its name, it shares the ill-repute that is due only to its perverted form. So sadly has the word declined from its first noble meaning that we hear in America of "a shoddy aristocracy," "a "petroleum aristocracy," and the like.

It is nearly three centuries since Bacon's *Novum Organum* did so much to emancipate natural science from the fetters of Aristotelian traditions. Political science has not obtained, and did not altogether need, the same emancipation. Plato and Aristotle are still, and will probably long remain, "the first of "those who know" in this subject. Whom of the moderns shall we set beside them? Not Comte nor Buckle, certainly, nor Herbert Spencer, nor Professor Seeley. But accumulated experience has supplied us with many data for our science that the ancients did not possess. They had in view the intense but narrow political life of the small city-state. We, in our politics, have in view the large modern country-state; in our broad outlook over history, many forms of state, primitive and civilized, European, American, Asiatic. Of what use are the old Greek divisions of states into monarchies and republics, into aristocracies and democracies, to the student of Hindu society or Hindu history? We need for our modern studies new categories, such as those which Professor Seeley suggests—"states organic, states in-"organic; tribal states, theocratic states, states "proper; city-states, country-states centralised or "decentralised; federations strong or weak; states "where government has a large province, states "where it has a small one; states which have a "government-making organ, states which have not; "states where the power of government is in one "hand, states where it is distributed."

Such a classification of states as is here roughly sketched is eminently suggestive and stimulating, and it is freed from any obscurity that may possibly cling to it by the brilliant concluding lecture. In this the history of the world is rapidly reviewed with the object of showing how the categories may be applied. All the lectures are full of the high seriousness with which Sir John Seeley regarded history and politics and the duties of his own professorship. The concluding page speaks of the lectures, in the claim they make for political science as the proper function of the historian, as "seed "cast upon the waters." The seed is not wasted. The historian is not likely to go back from the province claimed for him. The view of history that Professor Seeley inculcated with so much genius will not be forgotten, though his earnestness may have led him unduly to disparage the function of the narrator, the singer of the prose epic of a nation's story. To make the past live again on the printed page, or to enshrine, as unscientific Livy did, the spirit of a people in deathless words—this is something more than prosecuting "an insignificant "branch of literature." But the prophets are too apt to call each other "lying voices." Let us hear from each his own message.

INTELLECTUAL INDIA.[1]

It is but a short time since we had the pleasure of commenting favourably on the first two volumes of Mr. Bose's patriotic and useful work. The present volume continues the story with no less ability and fairness of judgment than were displayed in its predecessors. The subject is large and complicated, but Mr. Bose selects his main points with much discrimination, and disentangles the threads of influence with patience and address. His object on this occasion is to indicate the nature and operation of the influences that have affected the Hindu intellect under British rule. His next volume will prove a still stronger test of his powers, for in it he proposes to develop the present incidental sketch of the moulding influences of the modern literature of India into a fairly complete account of the existing intellectual condition of the Hindus as reflected in literature.

Mr. Bose opens his third volume with a luminous general introduction, summing up the substance of the facts he marshals and the conclusions he draws from them. His first chapter is preliminary—a rapid sketch of the history of the Hindu intellect from the earliest times down to the commencement of the British rule. In the Vedic period he finds the Indo-Aryans in all the simplicity, the vigour, and the credulity of adolescence: this is the Age of Belief. In the Buddhist-Hindu period—the Age of Reason—he finds them exhibiting the robustness and the philosophical spirit of matured manhood. The Puranic period shows them in the decay and decrepitude of old age. This is the somewhat dangerous commonplace of comparison of the life of a community with the life of an individual; but Mr. Bose refrains from driving it too far. The decadence he traces to two main causes: first, the caste system, which, while it promoted spirituality and quietism, checked industrialism and combativeness, and rendered impossible the continued development of the civilisation based upon it; and secondly, the Muhammadan conquest which swept away the kingly patronage of the Brahmans. "The downfall of the Kings meant the ruin of the learned Brahmans whom they patronised; and the ruin of the learned Brahmans meant the ruin of Hindu literature and Hindu science, just as the overthrow of the Kshatriza Rajputs meant the destruction of Hindu independence." At the same time, "it was chiefly the influence of Muhammadanism with its

[1] "A History of Hindu Civilisation during British Rule." By Pramatha Nath Bose, B.Sc. (Lond.), F.G.S., M.R.A.S., Author of "The Centenary Review of the Researches of the Asiatic Society of Bengal in Natural Sciences." In four volumes. Vol. III.: Intellectual Condition. (Calcutta: W. Newman and Co. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, and Co.)

doctrine of the brotherhood of man that produced that succession of earnest reformers who shed such lustre on India from the commencement of the fourteenth century to the beginning of the sixteenth;" and while the Muhammadan conquest hastened the decay of the Sanskrit literature, it gave a decided impulse to the development of the vernacular literature, and it tended to elevate the lower classes, and to promote revolt against the inequality of the caste-system.

The doctrine of equality, though as old as Buddhism, had not sufficient vitality to be a motive factor in the progress of Indian society till it came under the anti-caste influence of British contact. Mr. Bose outlines the influences of British liberalism on India, giving special prominence to the spread of education, with its political, religious, social, and literary results.

"The sense of individuality fostered by the English environment has been a fruitful source of important changes. In religion, it first created a somewhat chaotic confusion, but later on led to rationalistic Hinduism; in social polity, it has diminished the stringency of caste rules. But its effect upon literature has been far more remarkable than upon religion or society. The Hindu cannot break through his social bonds without exposing himself to penalties which cannot always be regarded lightly. But there are no such restrictions upon independence of thought in literature. Educated Hindus who hold aloof from reforms which would subject them to the penalties of excommunication have no hesitation to exhibit their individuality in literature. Vernacular literature has made rapid strides towards progress within the last fifty years; and that this progress is attributable to English influence is inferable from the fact that the progress is greatest where English education has spread most, and least where it is most backward. Purely vernacular or purely Sanskrit education has done little for the improvement of vernacular literature . . . . The most eminent writers in vernacular literature within the last fifty years have all been English-educated men."

Mr. Bose recognises that the emancipated Indian intellect has been producing not only valuable and healthy results, but also much that is worthless, and even mischievous; but he sees that such an evil is unavoidable under modern conditions of progress, and that its day will gradually pass. He also acknowledges that the renaissance is "marked rather by extent of surface than by depth." The same criticism applies but too widely in the West as well as in the East, but still "there can be no denying the fact that proportionately a great many more works of abiding interest appear in the West than in India." The transitional state through which the Hindus are at present passing must be held to account for much, and to justify a prolonged suspension of severe judgment. The material conditions of the country also handicap the people very seriously in the work of intellectual development.

Turning to the influence of English industrialism, Mr. Bose points out that the immediate effect of it on India was "to reduce the artisan class to the condition of agricultural labourers, at least to a very great extent"—a step backward in the intellectual movement of the Indian community. The English mills and factories, however, served as models, and during the past quarter of a century "many new industries, conducted entirely by Indian agency on modern methods, have been started by the Hindus." Technical education, as we saw before, has made a beginning, though a small one. Still, it is something by no means inconsiderable to have got the ideas planted. "The aversion of the upper classes from industrial occupations is gradually disappearing. Members of the highest caste are beginning to engage in industries such as tanning, oil-pressing, soap-making, etc., which have hitherto been confined to the lowest castes." The advantages of a cheap standard of living and of local knowledge are, however, "more than counterbalanced by the disadvantages of want of capital and want of mechanical and scientific knowledge." In dealing with the railways, Mr. Bose most properly points out, "they do not indicate the progress of India in any way whatever.'

"The fate of Indian art is doomed. The demand for it is daily decreasing, and will continue to decrease as the price of labour rises. In these days of cheap imitation things, genuine art productions requiring a vast amount of labour are not likely to hold their own. It is the larger industries involving scientific methods and appliances, such as cotton manufactures, iron-smelting, paper-making, etc., which are most likely to develop the resources of the country and make it rich, and which are, therefore, specially needed. There is also considerable scope for the application of the methods and results of modern science in agriculture. The skilled labour needed for the manufacturing and agricultural industries which are dependent more or less upon science is of various grades. The training required for the operatives would manifestly be best given in primary schools. But for teachers of such schools, chemists and others under whose direction large industries, manufacturing and agricultural, are carried on, a superior degree of scientific training is required, which may be called higher technical education. Besides the engineering colleges in the different provinces, and the chemical and physical laboratories of the medical colleges, and of such institutions as the Presidency College of Calcutta and the Elphinstone College of Bombay, there are but few institutions where higher technical education is now imparted in India."

The teaching of natural science has only in very recent years found favour in the eyes of the Indian educational authorities. The obstacles in the way of its progress are somewhat serious, but they are likely to diminish with collateral progress. There are but few openings for successful students, Europeans being almost always preferred. The allegation of native incapacity is a handy excuse, whatever may be the solidity of the grounds for making it. And here, again, "the extreme poverty of the people" stands in the way. Still, a beginning has been made, and time runs in favour of gradual developments. Mr. Bose reviews the progress of education generally—first English and then vernacular—and he devotes a special chapter to the education of women. The omens are all favourable, though the actual results are not yet to boast of; and the details he gives are interesting and instructive.

Perhaps the weightiest chapter of the book is the one dealing with the influence of the administrative policy of British rule. This topic touches the very heart of the whole question. The British peace is, of course, on the side of progress, but its influence is sadly marred by "the exclusive and unsympathetic policy" of the governing race. We, for our part, have always been insistent on the grievous consequences of such exclusiveness and lack of sympathy—consequences material and moral. Mr. Bose goes over the too familiar ground, firmly but without bitterness, and he concludes that the tendency of our policy "has been to keep down the material condition of India at a level lower than that of the

poorest and most backward country in Europe; to suppress the natural aspirations of the flower of Hindu manhood; and to foster in them habits of thought and traits of character which are detrimental to sound progress." The indictment is a heavy one, and, unhappily, it can be fully sustained. Mr. Bose acknowledges our good intentions. But, after all, "it is lamentable to think," as Sir George Cornewall Lewis wrote half a century ago, "how little good has hitherto resulted to the people of India from the acts of a Government which has of late years been, perhaps, the most benevolent which ever existed in any country."

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Indian Parliamentary Committee, at its meeting on April 21st, elected four members of its Working Committee in the room of Mr. W. S. Caine, Mr. W. S. B. Maclaren, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and Mr. A. Webb. The four new members are Dr. G. B. Clark, Sir John Leng, Mr. C. P. Scott, and Mr. A. R. Souttar.

Dr. G. B. Clark, who represents Caithness-shire, is a member of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, and is personally known in India, whence he returned only a few weeks ago. He is a doctor of medicine, and is said to devote almost as much time to politics as to patients. Educated at the Universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh, and at King's College, London, he was for some years Consul-General in London for the South African Republic. He knows all about the Boers, and would probably have been President Kruger's host if that cautious statesman had accepted Mr. Chamberlain's invitation and come to London. Dr. Clark is one of the militant Radical members of the House of Commons. His popularity in Caithness may be measured by the fact that at the last three General Elections his majority has been, roughly, about three times as large as his opponent's poll. Lord George Hamilton has already had a taste of Dr. Clark's quality in the Jhalawar business, and will, no doubt, hear from him again.

Sir John Leng, who also visited India last cold weather, is one of the few Englishmen who have made fortunes on the other side of the Tweed and represent Scottish constituencies in the House of Commons. He is the second son of the late Adam Leng of Hull, and brother of Sir William C. Leng of Sheffield. Born in 1828 and educated at Hull Grammar School he became, at the age of nineteen, sub-editor of the *Hull Advertiser* and, four years later, editor and managing proprietor of the *Dundee Advertiser*, which, with the *People's Journal*, is a tower of strength in Liberal Scotland. Sir John Leng, who has written "America in 1876," is thoroughly in sympathy with popular demands whether in Dundee or in British India. His ripe experience, sound judgment, and far-reaching influence will stand the Indian Reform party in good stead. He enters thoroughly into the spirit of the protests which the poorest classes of Indian consumers make against Lord George Hamilton's readjustment of the cotton duties.

Mr. Charles Prestwich Scott, the editor of the *Manchester Guardian*, is by common consent one of the most brilliant members of the House of Commons. It would not be easy to overstate the advantages which may accrue to the Indian reform movement from his active co-operation. Some twenty-five years ago, as an undergraduate at Corpus, Mr. Scott obtained a first in "Greats." A few years later he became editor of the newspaper which probably exercises more influence upon public opinion in the North of England than any other single force. Amateurs of the "new" journalism are sometimes heard to say that the *Guardian* is academic. The same critics would probably deny that "provincialism" is centred in London. When the Chitral question was being discussed the *Guardian* was, among morning journals, the strongest and most persistent opponent of the "forward" policy.

In the spring of 1891 a little knot of Oxford men were waiting in the new schools for the class list in the B C L. examination. When the clerk of the schools produced the list he called attention, privately, to one name among the "firsts"—the name of a non-collegiate student who had gone up to Oxford at the age of forty, or thereabouts, and had already secured a first in Jurisprudence. Four years later Mr. A. Robinson Souttar was elected member for Dumfriesshire, having in the meantime unsuccessfully contested the city of Oxford in opposition to Sir George Chesney. Mr. Souttar is not only a lawyer, but also a civil engineer and an Aberdonian. He has spent many years in India and knows the country and the people well, as Lord Ripon, among others, is able to testify. The working committee of the Indian Parliamentary Committee could not have found a worthier colleague.

The Indian Parliamentary Committee will shortly submit to Lord George Hamilton a Memorial in favour of the exemption, alike from excise and import duty, of all cotton cloths which do not contain any yarn of higher count than twenties. The Committee will, we understand, support their recommendation on the grounds that the suggested remission of tax upon coarser cloth will give relief to the extent of 10½ lakhs to the poorest classes, already depressed by a 4,000 per cent. duty on the salt they consume (viz., 2 rs. 8 annas per maund on what costs only 1 anna to produce); and that the recent imposition of 10½ lakhs of taxation upon coarser cloth is especially open to objection because the rest of the re-arrangement involved the remission of 37 lakhs (or, if the duty on fine yarns be added, 51 lakhs) of taxation, hitherto paid by the less needy classes.

The Committee will also point out that, while the the sole original ground for imposing excise duty was to prevent the import duty from operating protectively, the 3½ per cent. excise recently imposed on coarse cloth operates protectively in a high degree, inasmuch as Bombay and Manchester together supply at most two-fifths of the Indian consumption of such cloth, while three-fifths are produced by mills in Native States and by hand looms throughout India. Lord G. Hamilton will be reminded that the new excise duty distinctly encourages British

subjects to start new mills in Native States, and so deprive the population of British India of employment which they would otherwise have obtained from the further development of this industry. Attention will also be called to the fact that in many parts of India definite attempts are being made to organise a boycott of English cloth, and that as the ground of preaching this boycott is alleged injustice to India by the Government in favour of Lancashire, such a movement is undesirable, if not actually dangerous, from a political point of view.

As an indication of the feelings which have been excited by Lord G. Hamilton's readjustment of the cotton duties, we print the following communication from an Ahmednagar correspondent:—"By this time you must have learned how indignant India is at the insulting treatment that it has received from the British Cabinet in the matter of the cotton duties. It is, perhaps, the first instance in the history of the world in which, for the good wishes of a few individuals, the feelings and opinions of three hundred millions have been insulted and mocked. If the Indian members of Legislative Councils have any sense of duty, they will resign their seats upon bodies for which Acts are manufactured in England. The mass of the people are doing their duty. Meetings in all the principal towns of India have been held, protesting against the new legislation, and resolving not to buy Lancashire cloth till this injustice is removed. I was never for Protection. I am a Free-trader. But I feel insulted at the attitude of the India Office towards Indian public opinion. The new Acts mean nothing else than that Manchester people would compel us to buy their goods. If I am a man, I will not be compelled. Till now I have worn English cloth. I will not wear it hereafter, because I cannot see my people slighted. Every true son of India ought to feel as I do. If he is proud of his ancient civilization, if he is proud of Muhammadan or Aryan descent, if he is proud of his Moghul, Rajput, or Maratha ancestor, if he is a man, he ought to repulse this rule by Lancashire. We must once for all open the eyes of blinded Lancashire and, through them, the eyes of all England to the fact that the true way of developing English trade is not to put obstacles in the way of Indian trade but to develop it. Ahmednagar has already achieved a great success. The cloth merchants here have ordered and obtained a large stock of Indian cloth. The leaders have set an example and the people are following it. To save our country from certain ruin England must see the results of its suicidal policy, and she can only see them through Lancashire. Let us, therefore, burn—the common remedy of the *Hakim*—Lancashire and ourselves too, if necessary, to bring the British Parliament to its senses."

The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure continues its sittings at the Indian Office with closed doors. A rumour was current some time ago to the effect that Lord Welby and his colleagues would probably relax this rule, and admit representatives of the Press. It is hard to see why such strict secrecy is observed.

The "Quetta Directory," 1896 (R. R. Golwala and Co., Quetta), has probably served the purpose which its compiler had in view when the first edition was issued in 1890. There then existed an "impenetrable haziness" respecting Baluchistan, geographically, historically, and socially. It is not the fault of Messrs. Golwala if the gloom has not, to some extent, been dispelled. The seventh edition of the directory contains information on a large variety of subjects, from a history of the country to a tariff of prices for the hire of hackney carriages in Quetta. It is a "Kelly," a "Whitaker," and a "Baedeker" at the same time. We are given a directory of European residents in Quetta, with a full list of British Civil and Military (especially Military) Establishments in the country. Quite a third of the volume is devoted to laws and regulations in force, orders passed, and the rules made under them by the Supreme and the Local Governments. A chapter on frontier railways contains some valuable information, and the Indian taxpayer will observe with mixed feelings the statement that the total cost of 417 miles of frontier railway is 993 lakhs. A descriptive account of the principal buildings in Quetta is intended to serve as a guide-book to the tourist, who may recognise civilisation in the form of several churches and a brewery.

INDIAN MILITARY EXPENDITURE.[1]

By DINSHA EDULJI WACHA.

In the matter of military expenditure I have been for a long time a sort of wandering minstrel on more than one platform. If Sir James Westland says that exchange, and exchange alone, is the burthen of his song, I must acknowledge that military expenditure, and that expenditure alone, has been the theme of my minstrelsy from year to year during the last ten years. But the songster who sang so lustily of exchange is now hushed, not only in India, but in England. Expert opinion in England is now in accord with our own, that the growth of military expenditure is a more potent cause of the embarrassed condition of the finances of the country than the much-abused and blameless exchange. The parable originally given currency to by the Bombay Presidency Association, though jeered at in the Supreme Legislative Council, was soon taken up by the British Committee of the Congress, and vigorously supported twice within the last twelve months by Sir Auckland Colvin, the ex-Finance Minister at whose feet Sir James Westland had sat and taken many a lesson in Indian finance. It was echoed by Sir David Barbour, another able Finance Minister, and the immediate successor of Sir Auckland. As if these two Indian

[1] This article consists of the principal portions of the Address delivered by Mr. Wacha at the Indian National Congress, last December, in support of the third resolution, which was as follows:—"That this Congress again records its firm conviction that, in view of the embarrassed condition of the finances of the country, the only remedy for the present state of things is a material curtailment in the expenditure on the army services and other military expenditure, home charges and the cost of civil administration, and it notices with satisfaction that expert opinion in England has now come over to the view of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, that growth in military expenditure is a more potent cause of Indian financial embarrassment than the condition of exchange."

expert authorities were not enough, there arose Mr. A. J. Wilson, an expert well known in English financial circles, to demonstrate with even greater force and freshness the utter fallacy of Sir James Westland's assertion. The burden of the refrain did not end with him. It was soon taken up by two journals of the highest economic repute, the *Statist* and the *Economist*. The Congress has now been fully vindicated in its assertion regarding the appalling growth of military expenditure as the source of all our financial woes since 1885. Every word annually said from the Congress platform on the subject, from the date of the birth of the Congress at Bombay, has been verified.

Sir James Westland, in his Budget speech in 1893, admitted that between 1885 and 1888 the military expenditure predominated, and that it embarrassed the finances. But he asserted that since 1888-89 exchange had been the only cause of disturbance in the finances of the country. Here are his words :—

"My argument was that that increase (namely, increase in military expenditure) had been met by the fiscal steps we had recourse to in 1888, and that the necessities that arose since 1888 were due to exchange, and exchange alone. It did not arise, therefore, in immediate connexion with the discussion of our present position."

This statement, coupled with another made by General Sir Henry Brackenbury, that during the last few years the real growth in the army services has been only 4½ lakhs, the remaining 57½ lakhs being entirely owing to exchange, has greatly surprised me. Sir H. Brackenbury observed :—

"Between 1885-86 and 1893-94 there has been a rise of 62 lakhs of rupees in military budget estimates, but of this 62 lakhs, 57½ were due to fall in exchange—the actual increase in all these years, apart from exchange, was 4,50,000 rupees."

I have failed to discover the slightest confirmation of these figures. The statements of both officials seem to have been made without due investigation. From the following short table which I have prepared of the details of army expenditure from 1888-89—the figures being all taken from the annual blue, or rather yellow, books on the finance and revenue accounts of the Government of India—I find that neither Sir J. Westland's nor Sir H. Brackenbury's statements can be borne out.

Details of Net Army Charges—1887-88 compared with 1893-94.

(*Finance and Revenue Accounts.*)

Heads.	In India.			In England.			Exchange.		
	1887-8. In Lakhs.	1893-4. In Lakhs.	Increase or Decrease. Lakhs.	1887-8. In Lakhs.	1893-4. In Lakhs.	Incresse or Decrease. Lakhs.	1887-8. In Lakhs.	1893-4. In Lakhs.	Increase or Decrease. Lakhs.
Effective Services.									
1. Army and Garrison Staff	51·41	59·72	1·31	..	..	..	..	..	..
2. Administrative ,, ...	19·10	20·08	0·98	..	..	..	..	..	..
3. Regimental Pay, etc.	715·87	787·76	71·89	92·48	107·04	14·56	38·86	69·56	30·70
4. Commissariat, ,, ...	319·33	295·90	—23·43	3·73	3·08	—0·65	1·56	2·00	0·44
5. Remounted ,, ...	21·66	28·58	6·92	0·95	..	—0·95	0·39	..	—0·39
6. Clothing ,, ...	10·60	16·68	6·08	24·69	19·17	—5·52	10·37	12·46	2·09
7. Barracks ,, ...	22·88	22·75	—0·13	..	..	..	..	..	..
8. Martial Law	2·38	4·08	1·70	..	..	..	..	..	..
9. Medical	62·82	68·05	5·23	5·14	3·19	—1·95	2·16	2·07	—0·09
10. Ordnance	39·02	73·99	34·97	32·55	54·86	22·31	13·67	3·56	—10·11
11. Ecclesiastical	3·07	2·84	—0·23	..	..	..	..	..	..
12. Education	3·60	4·66	1·06	..	..	..	..	..	..
13. Sea Transport	4 20	5·74	1·54	.20·34	25·00	4·66	8·54	16·24	7·70
14. Miscellaneous	38·55	31·22	—7·33	0·72	0·43	—0·29	0·30	0·28	—0·02
15. Volunteers	10·72	17·74	7·02	..	..	..	..	..	..
Total Effective ..	1325·21	1432·79	107·58	180·69	212·77	32·17	75·85	106·17	30·32
Non-Effective Services.									
16. Rewards	0·79	1·06	0·27	..	..	..	..	..	..
17. European Pensions	9·96	11·55	1·59	181·48	215·51	34·03	76·26	140·05	73·79
18. Native ,, ...	64·87	72·57	7·70	..	..	..	..	..	..
19. Widows ,, ...	—2·05	—4·75	—2·70	7·82	8·49	0·67	3·28	5·51	2·23
Total Non-Effective ..	73·57	80·43	6·86	189·30	224·00	34·70	79·54	145·56	66·02
Grand Total ..	1398·78	1513·22	114·44	369·90	436·77	66·87	155·39	251·73	96·34

Now, according to the two official authorities I have named, the expenditure proper on the army services would show no material growth, but exchange would exhibit a growth of 57½ lakhs. As a matter of fact the former is considerable and exceeds the latter to a large extent. I may mention that all my figures have reference to *net* charges—that is to say, gross expenditure *minus* the receipts under each head. The total effective services in 1887-88 in India cost 13·25 crores. In 1893-94 they rose to 14·33 crores or a net growth of 1.08 crores. The charges in England under the same head between 1887-88 and 1893-94 stood at 1·80 and 2·13 crores respectively, that is to say, they showed a net growth of 33 lakhs. The total net growth was, therefore, equal to 1·41 crores. What was the burden of exchange on the effective services during the same period? In 1887-88, when the average rate for the year was

16·37d. per Rupee, and the expenditure in England amounted to 1·80 crores, it amounted to 78·85 lakhs. In 1893-94, with the rate at 14·54d. per Rupee, it came to 106·17 lakhs. The increase equalled 30·32 lakhs. In other words, the actual army effective charges were 1·71 crores more, exclusive of exchange, in 1893-94 compared with 1887-88. These figures contradict Sir James Westland's and Sir Henry Brackenbury's statements. But this is not the whole tale regarding the growth of military expenditure. The non-effective service charges, which almost wholly consist of pensions to Native and European armies, have to be considered also. In India, these stood at 73·57 lakhs in 1887-88. In 1893-94, they amounted to 80·43 or a growth of 6 86 lakhs. In England, they rose from 189·30 to 224 lakhs equivalent to a growth of 34·70 lakhs. The total growth was 41·56 lakhs. Exchange in reference to these charges rose from 79·54 to 145·56 lakhs or an increase of 66·02 lakhs. The combined charges for effective and non-effective services and exchange may now be summarised as under :—

	Crores.	Total.
Effective Charges .... Growth=	1·41	
Non-Effective Charges do. =	0·42	
	——	1·83 Crores.
	Lakhs.	
Exchange Charges, Effective ......Growth=	30·32	
Do. Non-Effective do. =	66·02	
	——	0·96 ,,
		2·79 ,,

It is clear, therefore, that, despite the difference of 1·88d. per Rupee, owing to the fall in the value of silver measured by gold, between 1887-88 and 1893-94, the actual military expenditure was nearly twice as much as the charges of exchange on the same.

Let me show the growth of some of the principal items of expenditure. Take, for instance, item 3 of the table, namely, Regimental pay and allowances. In India, these rose from 7·16 crores in 1887-88 to 7·88 crores in 1893-94. The increase was equal to 72 lakhs. In England it rose during the same period from 92·48 lakhs to 1·07 crores, or an increase of 14·52 lakhs—say, in all, a growth of 86·52 lakhs, apart from 31 lakhs under this head for exchange. The evidence collected by the Fawcett Committee (1871-74), as far as military expenditure went, showed that India was being burdened with a larger expenditure owing to the exigencies of organisation, equipment, pay, and so forth of the Indian army, with which the British army has been amalgamated since 1859, in spite of the warnings and protests of those military friends who knew how oppressive an impost that amalgamation would prove. Every change in clothing, in arms, in ammunition and what not brings an additional burden on India, apart from the increase in the soldier's pay. In arms and ammunition especially, since the days of the frontier fireworks, which have already cost us 15 crores in 10 years, there have gone on incessant changes. No sooner is a gun or a rifle of a particular patent or inventor supplied to the army than a new weapon is substituted in its place. The old expenditure incurred soon becomes so much of a dead loss, which in the end, of course, comes out of the pocket of the Indian taxpayers. This is the result of the fatal scheme of army amalgamation. I lay at its door all India's financial embarrassments regarding military finance, next to the aggressive policy on the frontiers. Poor India is made a joint partner with rich England, with no voice in the regulation of her army expenditure. The War Office has only to order, and the helpless Government of India has simply to obey it. There is no "if" or "but"—such is the iniquity and tyrannical character of this unfair partnership. Every change in the English army causes a corresponding change here, whether in the matter of the soldier's pay and allowances, his clothing, his arms, his food, and so on, or in the matter of mobilisation. But to India the cost is well-nigh double and treble that of England. The lower the exchange, the outlay, especially on ordnance, and the increased amounts of the soldier's pay and pensions, inflict an intolerable burden on the treasury. This is one of the most crying of financial injustices, against which both the Government and the public at large, and the Congress especially, have hitherto inveighed in vain. Let us hope that the Royal Commission may recommend a relief which may be considered just by India, though I am not sanguine that any such relief may be expected from that official body.

Exchange has been proved to be a bugbear. In the first place, its burden has not been so embarrassing as the Finance Minister has endeavoured to make out. And in the second place, it should never be forgotten that during the last few years the amount itself of sterling remittances has increased by a million. In brief, while civil and military expenditure has increased 6·25 crores of rupees in seven years, exchange has only increased 4·25 crores. To quote the language of the British Committee :

> "In other words for every rupee of additional burden entailed by the fall in exchange, the services add another rupee and a-half on their own account. . . . . The Government of India have not been content with a moderate increase of expenditure, but have continued, in reckless disregard of the capacities of Indian revenue, to increase expenditure in the civil and military services (however useful and desirable that expenditure may be) at a rate which under all circumstances is absolutely unjustifiable."

It only remains for us to appeal to the Government to curtail this overgrown expenditure in the civil and military services. As to the military charges Sir Auckland Colvin in his second contribution to the pages of the *Nineteenth Century* for October last observed that he does not look forward to any curtailment of them. He says :

> "Of the three causes to which increase of net expenditure during the last ten years is mainly due, to one only, and to the only one to which it is beyond the power of man to control, can we look for any relief. So far as the two other causes of the increase of net expenditure be within the control of the authorities, whether in India or in England, it is clear now that no reduction can be looked for; neither in the army charges, nor in the net charges for State guaranteed or aided railways, will any diminution be conceded. We must look to exchange alone for assistance."

Then, there is every probability of the military authorities bringing the European forces to the requisite strength in proportion to the existing

native army, inclusive of the Imperial Service Corps and the irregular frontier levies. The probability is indeed of a portentous character. An additional 10,000 European soldiers would cost about 2 crores of rupees. Imagine the burden! When we are all striving our best to prove conclusively how burdensome has been the existing army expenditure, besides being the principal cause of the financial embarrassments which during the last few years have led to the additional taxation of 7 crores apart from the benevolence exacted from the Provincial Governments and the encroachments on the Famine Insurance Fund, here we are threatened with a large additional expenditure. But if there is to be no curtailment at the best in military expenditure, how are they going to ease the exchequer? Sir Auckland Colvin thinks we must look to exchange alone. Is it possible that from such a disturbing factor there could be any sensible permanent relief to the finances, and therefore to the taxpayer? One of the soundest canons of public finance is that a State should rely only on permanent sources of revenue and regulate its expenditure on factors which may not be of a fluctuating or uncertain character. But here we are recommended to rely on a most uncertain factor like exchange, the rise or fall of a penny in which makes the difference of over a crore. If there is to be a substantial reduction it would only be in the permanent establishments which have overgrown, and nowhere else. I have pointed out how far civil and military expenditure has increased during the last few years. It follows that any hope of curtailment must be found there and there alone.

THE COST OF SOLVENCY TO INDIA.

From "THE TIMES."

The text of Sir James Westland's Budget has now reached England. It confirms the views which we had already formed of it from the full telegrams published in the *Times* three weeks ago. But a minute scrutiny gives additional prominence to two features of the past year's finance. Sir James Westland's Budget is to some extent a budget of windfalls, we had almost said of surprises. There was, first of all, the unexpected rise in exchange, which practically dominated the situation. There were also a number of minor augmentations on both sides, such as the Chitral expedition to the debit of the Government and the salt tax to its credit in Madras. The second fact disclosed by a careful examination of the budget is that the Indian revenues are being levied with greater exactitude all round. Of late years there has not only been increased taxation, but the previously existing taxes have been made to yield larger amounts. We should be very happy if we could ascribe this expansion altogether to the natural development of Indian resources. But an analysis of the items renders so pleasing an explanation mere optimism. Sir James Westland has achieved solvency for Indian finance, yet in spite of the good gifts of fortune, which he is the first to acknowledge, that solvency has only been achieved by continuous and heavy additions to the burdens of the people.

In this respect Sir James Westland inherits the results of his predecessors' labours. During the past ten years, from 1886 onwards, it is estimated that new taxation to the extent of just under sixty millions of rupees has been imposed on India. The account is not a simple one, and certain items may have to be entered on the other side. But it has been made up with considerable care by Mr. A. K. Connell, whose statement stands thus. Between the years 1884 and 1889 a period of recurring deficits aggregating fifty millions of rupees took place. This had to be met by increased taxation, and after another period of deficits, in 1892 to 1894, the specified new taxes imposed on India during the last ten years make up a total of Rs. 59,829,000.

We have said that a statement of this sort is open to criticism on both sides of the account. Not less open to comment is Mr. Connell's statement of the expansion of the previously existing revenues during the same period. For that expansion is due in some measure to the increasing population, and to railway or irrigation extensions, and not to a severer pressure upon the people. Mr. Connell shows that during eleven years a sum of over sixty millions of rupees has been added to the Indian revenues by the expansion of pre-existing taxes, while another sixty millions of new taxes have been imposed during the same period. But even this enormous increment has only produced a working surplus after reducing the famine grant by five million rupees in a year of threatened famine, and with the help of an unexpected, perhaps a temporary, rise in the exchange.

Such, according to Mr. Connell, has been the cost of solvency to India. If we turn from his elaborate calculations to the severer columns of the Abstract presented by the Secretary of State to Parliament, we find that the annual revenue of India increased from 706 million rupees in 1884-85 to 905 million in 1893-94, a total increment of close on 200 million rupees during the ten years with which the last Parliamentary Abstract deals—with a still further increase since then. It is an enormous expansion of revenue for an Asiatic country to bear. Here, again, we must avoid the danger of generalities. For during the ten years Upper Burma was added to the Indian Empire, and an increase of ninety million rupees has taken place in the receipts from railways, canals, and other productive works. But the Parliamentary Return shows an increase of 102 million rupees under the two headings of "Land Revenue" and "Taxes" alone during the ten years. Whether we take the accounts as made up by Mr. Connell to last year, or to 1894 as presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State, the ten years show an addition to Indian taxation which must make all who wish well to our rule in India pause before they congratulate themselves on the result.

Some of the extra taxation is of a character which severely presses upon the people. The salt tax, according to Mr. Connell, was augmented by eighteen million of rupees between 1884-85 and 1893-94. Sir James Westland's Budget shows a still further increase, making a total addition of about twenty-three million rupees levied on a necessity of life between 1884-85 and 1895-96. This increase arises

partly from an increase in the population, partly from their power of purchasing larger quantities of salt, partly from a windfall, and partly from a more uniform levy of the tax throughout India. But after making full allowance for these sources of increment, there has been a serious addition to the burdens of the poor; and we are again forced to realize the cost of solvency to the Indian people. In the same way the land revenue has been increased by thirty-seven million of rupees from 1884-85 to 1893-94, and by forty-three million rupees if we carry down the account to the present year. This is largely due to the rise in prices, a rise owing in part to the opening up of India by means of railways and irrigation, but partly, it would now appear, to depreciation of the rupee. The cultivators get more rupees for their crops, the Government claims more rupees from the cultivators, and it pays away more rupees alike in salaries and in discharge of its interest on gold debts. But difficult as it may be to work out the equation, the net result to the Indian cultivator is that throughout many districts he feels he is paying more than he used to pay, and in some he finds an increasing difficulty in meeting the increased demand.

The form of taxation which presses least heavily on the people is the import duties. The poorest classes need not contribute to those duties at all, and as a matter of fact they contribute a mere trifle to them. But it is in regard to these very import duties, levied from the middle classes who have chiefly prospered under British rule, that the Indian Government finds itself restricted. It is allowed to raise the rent of the peasant for his land and to levy a severer impost on the poorest classes for their salt; but it is denied a free hand in regard to the taxation of the middle and upper classes by means of the import duties, which they are willing and able to pay.

If, therefore, solvency has been again attained for India, we should not forget what it has cost the Indian poor. In certain provinces that cost has been a heavy one. The statements repeatedly made on the authority of Mr. Alexander Rogers, a late member of the Governor of Bombay's Council, still remain unanswered, and were lately presented afresh to Parliament in the form of questions to the Secretary of State. As a whole they amount to a charge of fiscal severities in the Madras Presidency which in 1893-94 led to the issue of 209,517 notices for sale of property against land revenue defaulters and to 14,198 of the Government tenants being sold up. Lord George Hamilton stated that the Government in Madras had been instructed to report on the matter. Yet we cannot forget that several years have elapsed since the question was raised by Indian administrators of high standing, and that some years have also passed since the Government of Madras was directed to submit an explanation. It may be that the explanation will prove a sufficient one, but it should be rendered without further delay. When we work the percentages the totals take a less alarming form. Yet outstanding charges of this sort create an uneasiness as to what the progress of the Indian revenues really means to the people, and as to the measures by which Indian solvency has been attained.

THE "FORWARD" POLICY.

THE AMIR AND THE KAFIRS.

A BLUNDERING AGREEMENT.

THE "EXPERTS," SOME MORTALS, AND LORD G. HAMILTON.

We reproduce from the *Daily News* of April 20th, the following excellent account of the amazing error in the Durand agreement, upon which we comment in "Indiana." The Parliamentary questions which are mentioned will be found in our Parliamentary supplement.

There has been some puzzling news of late from the regions near Chitral, where we have been settling boundaries with the Amír. It was only in November, 1893, that Sir Mortimer Durand made an agreement with the Amír, which was published as recently as Friday last, that he was not to exercise interference in Swat, Bajaur, or Chitral, including the Arnawai or Bashgal Valley. Last November, when two years had hardly elapsed, we had news that the troops of the Amír have been making havoc in the Bashgal Valley, and cruelly treating the Kafirs, a curious and ancient people, in whom students of ethnology and readers of books of travel are keenly interested. It has been assumed that at the least the Amír or his generals had been guilty of an oversight, and that he would be called upon to restore some of the captured Kafirs to their homes. As recently as Thursday last questions were asked in Parliament on the subject. These questions clearly took it for granted that the Durand agreement had been violated, that the Government must take steps to secure the restitution of territory "improperly acquired, and such reparation as was now possible for the slaughter and enslavement of the many thousands of Kafirs in a district which was specially included within the British dominions."

A GEOGRAPHICAL MISTAKE.

The full significance of Lord George Hamilton's replies does not seem to have been realised; but the fact is this. We have no control of the Bashgal Valley at all; it is the Amír's, to do just what he pleases with, unless we can persuade him (or decide that it is desirable to coerce him) into friendly treatment of the Kafirs. The Durand agreement excludes from the Amír's influence what is called the "Arnawai *or* Bashgal Valley": but it turns out that there is no Arnawai *or* Bashgal Valley. The Arnawai is one river, and the Bashgal is another river. Their directions both lie north-west and sout-east in a line crossing the Chitral River, which is also known as the Kuna. If we had got the whole of this line, we should have interposed a barrier between Afghan and Chitral territory; and that has certainly been an object of British diplomacy for years. But clearly our diplomacy has blundered, and the Amír has got the better bargain. The Amír has said in effect, "You asked for the Arnawai river, and I supposed you meant the Arnawai. The Bashgal is another valley; that is, part of Kafiristan, and belongs to me." It was in the Durand agreement "that any

differences of detail such as those which will have to be considered hereafter by the officers appointed to demarcate the boundary line shall be settled in a friendly spirit, so as to remove for the future, as far as possible, all causes of doubt and misunderstanding between the two Governments." In this case the Amír has certainly got the benefit of the doubt. It is admitted that he has got the territory over which the Mehtars of Chitral have heretofore claimed rights and territory visited by Dr (now Sir George) Robertson, with the result, according to Sir Lepel Griffin, that the people there were encouraged to look for English protection. The following are the terms in which Lord George Hamilton announced our virtual surrender of the Bashgal Valley:

"When the delimitation began in the field it was found that the Bashgal and Arnawai Valleys ran in different directions, the Arnawai draining into the Kunar from the east and the Bashgal River from the west. The frontier was therefore revised, and the revision placed within the sphere of influence of the Amír of the Bashgal Valley, which is west of the Kunar River, and over which the Mahtars of Chitral have claimed rights. This included part of the country visited by Sir G. Robertson in 1890 and 1891."

The Amír's Bargain.

The Parliamentary paper issued on Friday leaves members of Parliament and the public without one means of judging the exact extent of the concession made to the Amír, and of determining how far this concession was really made on a "difference of detail." The fourth clause of the agreement says that the object of the Frontier Commissioners should be to "arrive by mutual understanding at a boundary which shall adhere with the greatest possible exactness to the line shown in the map attached to this agreement, having due regard to the existing local rights of villages adjoining the frontier." Did not the map settle the question whether the Bashgal Valley was to be excluded from Afghanistan or not? The inference from Lord George Hamilton's answer and from the non-appearance of the map is that it did. No map accompanies the Parliamentary paper, and we are told in a footnote that the map is "not reproduced because the actual demarcation of the frontier under Clause 4 is not completed." But another proof that the line meant by the Indian Government must have been the Bashgal Valley, since handed over to the Amír, seems to be afforded by a map now before us with this note: "Compiled and drawn in the Intelligence Division, War Office, mainly from the latest Indian survey and Russian staff maps, under the direction of Lieut.-Col. J. C. Dalton, R.A., D.A.A.G., 1892. Revised April, 1893." Now, upon this official map we find the river on the Kafiristan side of the Kunar marked as the "Arnawai, or Bashgal River," but no trace of the river which Lord George Hamilton now tells us is the Arnawai on the Dir side of the Kunar. The communications between Kafiristan and Chitral are by this Bashgal Valley, which has been wrongly named the Arnawai. That it was not originally intended that he should have the control of these communications is settled by the references to the Amír and Chitral in the Chitral Blue-books. However, the answer of Lord George Hamilton proves that some one has blundered. This north-east slice of Kafiristan, like all the rest of it, is in consequence in the actual possession of the Amír; and the English lady-physician to Abdul Rahman is quite right in saying that he had acquired his freedom to subdue all Kafiristan by treaty with Great Britain.

The Kafir Heroes.

The great interest taken in the Kafirs of the Hindu Kush is partly inspired by a remarkable tradition of their heroic disregard of danger and their preference of death to surrender. It is very curious that the tradition has been repeated in the experience of last autumn, unless Dr. Lillias Hamilton has been deceived by a lying story based on the old tradition. We give the two stories one after the other.

"The Story of 1866.

"In 1866 a fortified Kafir village, attacked on the side of Badakshan, seeing resistance hopeless, preferred a voluntary "suttee" to embracing Islam or becoming slaves to Muhammadans. The wounded Kafirs, emaciated by hunger, gave their last strength to gathering large beams, on which the women poured their last store of oil, and holding their children by the hand, entered the huge funeral pyre, where the invaders found them all burned to death."—Dr. G. W. Leitner, in the *Globe*.

"The Story of 1895.

"The tribe called Sia Posh (black dress) engaged in a fierce fight with the Amír's troops at a place called Shespoos. They were all armed with good firearms, and commenced the battle in the open. The Afghans under Captain Mahomed Ali Khan, consisting of several battalions of well-trained men, besides Ghazis from Panjshir, Anderab and Lozman, made considerable havoc among the undisciplined Kafirs, who were forced to retire to their fortified villages, whence they continued to fire on the Afghans through holes in the walls. The tables were now turned; the Kafirs lost but few men, the Afghans many. So, contrary to the express orders of the Amír, who wished every one to be taken alive, the captain was obliged to make use of the heavy guns. In this way many of the houses were destroyed, and the Kafirs were obliged to fly for protection from one village to another, until finally they were completely routed. The Afghan soldiers then rushed into one of the villages to capture all the remainder alive, but some 400 or 500 of them set fire to their own buildings and perished in the flames, rather than fall into the hands of the enemy.—Dr. Lillias Hamilton, in letter dated Kabul, Feb. 19th, in *Times* of April 4th."

It is a curious fact that Dr. G. W. Leitner, from whom we have the story of 1866, finished it with the words: "History may repeat itself, and, unless we save Kafiristan, leave a blot on British honour such as no subsequent professions can efface."

Mr. H. C. Thomson, describing the mounted fastnesses of these Kafirs in his "Chitral Campaign," said of their country:—

"It is quite possible that Kafiristan, and not Chitral, may be found to be the key of the position. It is said to be quite inaccessible, and it it is known that Timur was obliged to leave it unconquered, after losing a great number of men in the attempt to subdue it. On the other hand it is asserted, with some show of reason, that Alexander the Great, starting from Balkh, came down through the western portion of Kafiristan to the Kunar river, near Jellalabad, so it is quite possible there may prove to be a practicable road through it, though the country through which Colonel Holditch passed was so steep and rugged that it took him seven hours a day to march eight miles."

We may quote as a sequel to this one further passage from Dr. Lillias Hamilton:—

"In the map brought by Captain Mahomed Ali Khan one place was marked Kali Timoor—the fort of Timoor—and he explained that on a stone there he had found the following words engraved: 'The Amír Timoor of the Mogul Dynasty conquered this country so far, but was unable to proceed

further.' The Amír's officer then went on to say that on that same stone he has engraved the following words from the Koran: 'The true faith in one God has overcome the infidels or believers in many gods.' Also the following inscription: 'In the year 1313 [*i.e.*, 1895], during the reign of the Wise King, Amír Abdurrahman Khan, the whole of Kafiristan was conquered and incorporated in the kingdom of Afghanistan.'"

The Amír was evidently of Mr. Thomson's opinion, for he defended his determination to have his authority acknowledged in Kafiristan on the plea that if he did not hold all the country with a strong hand, the Russians would soon be within two days' march of his capital. The Amír is, therefore, already master of all Kafiristan, and he owes his position in its north-eastern parts adjoining Chitral to a mistake in the interpretation of the Durand agreement.

The *Daily News* wrote on April 21st: As regards those Kafirs of the Hindu Kush there is a curious difference between the statement made in the House of Commons last night by Lord George Hamilton and that in the Reuter's telegram from Simla. The Secretary for India says the Amír has directed his officers to treat the Kafirs leniently, and not to convert them against their will. The direction would be amusing if this were a laughing matter. The Reuter version is that the Amír is treating "*submissive* Kafirs with extreme leniency, and has despatched strict orders to the Afghan officials not to oppress the Kafirs or seek to convert them to Islamism by force." There is not much in this to encourage the friends of the Kafirs. What satisfaction there is to be got out of the telegram lies in fact that the Amír seems to be impressed with the desirability of conciliating public opinion in this country. From the defence of his conduct in Kafiristan, which has been sent to this country by his lady physician, we know that he is aware of the interest taken in the Kafirs by men of light and leading here. If, as Lord George Hamilton says, the Amír has prohibited traffic in Kafir slaves, he has admitted, what his lady physician denied, that there has been such traffic. The House of Commons is informed that no opportunity has presented itself to the Viceroy to press the Amír on behalf of the Kafirs. We stated the reason yesterday in our article explaining the extraordinary blunder made in the Durand agreement. The Kafirs have been handed over to the Amír's tender mercies in consequence of the bungling of some one in India; and the Viceroy must feel Kafiristan to be for us a delicate and humiliating subject.

On April 23rd the *Daily News* added:—It is amusing to follow Lord George Hamilton's answers to questions about the Amír and the Kafirs. The House of Commons gets glimpses of the truth, but is not allowed to get the whole truth. How innocent was his answer yesterday afternoon! "After the Durand Convention was agreed to an enquiry took place, and in certain places it was found that the topographical features of the country did not quite correspond with the terms of the Convention." No; we should think it did not correspond, for what did he tell the House on Thursday last?

When the delimitation began in the field it was found that the Bashgal and Arnawai rivers ran in different directions, the Arnawai draining into the Kunar from the east and the Bashgal River from the west. The frontier was therefore revised, and the revision placed within the sphere of influence of the Amír, the Bashgal Valley, which is west of the Kunar River, and over which the Mehtars of Chitral have claimed rights.

This was the valley that the Durand agreement was intended to exclude from the influence of the Amír. As we explained on Monday, it was described in the agreement as the Arnawai *or* Bashgal River, in apparent ignorance of the fact that the Arnawai and Bashgal were different rivers, and not one and the same. But the agreement also defined the territory to be excluded from the influence of the Amír by the stipulation that the Commissioners who carried out the demarcation should "adhere with the greatest possible exactness to the line shown in the map attached to this agreement." Hence we asked whether the map did not make it clear that the Bashgal Valley was meant; and hence the interest attaching to that map, which has not been reproduced with the Chitral papers containing the Durand agreement. Lord George has no spare copies of the map. It is, and will remain, a rarity.

Reviews.

SKETCHES BY PAI.

Stray Sketches in Chakmapore. From the note-book of an idle citizen. By N. W. PAI, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, High Court. (Bombay).

When the last page has been turned, the last sentence ransacked for its concealed jest—for it very soon becomes painfully obvious to the reader that Mr. Pai is nothing if not a wag—the question that first arises in one's mind is, why "Sketches?" We have had "Sketches by Boz," Washington Irving's "Sketch-book," Thackeray's "Sketch-book," and numerous others. We have seen sketches by great artists which were regarded by connoisseurs as priceless. And in the case of more than one illustrator of modern times the sketch has been adopted as the neatest and most convenient form of expression. But the distinguishing feature which all great sketches, both in literature and art, possess, is the absence of the "sketchiness" which is the main characteristic of Mr. Pai's book. A sketch should, in order to have any value, artistic or literary, give a clear and connected impression of the outlines and definitive features of the subject chosen for treatment, omitting all unnecessary detail. Those artists who have attained any eminence in the presentation of their more permanent work in the form of sketches have done so by first carefully drawing in a complete study then carefully deleting everything superfluous. So the accidental omission of any essential point is guarded against. And when a sketch is taken simply as the basis of future and more elaborate work it becomes useful and valuable only in proportion as the genius of the artist enables him to seize at once on the important traits of his subject. What is true of art in this connection is equally true of literature, postulating only the necessity of literary and grammatical finish in the

latter case as correctness of drawing is postulated in the former. It is true that the term sketch has been used in literature to include many a little picture as carefully elaborated as a miniature or as some of Meissonier's eight inch by six canvases, now worth about twenty-five pounds per square inch. But that is absolutely no reason for allowing the extension of the term in an opposite direction to include a tabulation, resembling in style the average auctioneer's catalogue, of details chosen more arbitrarily than are the objects selected for portrayal by the Röntgen rays, which at any rate show the skeleton form underlying the outer man, although they dignify his collar-stud and trousers-buttons with a permanence denied to his brain or heart. It is towards this limit that Mr. Pai strains the definition of the word "sketch." Imagine a Röntgen vacuum-tube which scorns skeletons and casts images of buttons, and you have an allegory of Mr. Pai's faculty of literary selection. Tommy Traddles, another lawyer of much leisure, spent his spare time in drawing marvellous skeletons of divers sorts, and we cannot help thinking that he was much better occupied than Mr. Pai.

The author pleads guilty to a double motive for the publication of this volume. The first is a desire to amuse the reader, the second is a hope of arousing his interest sufficiently to encourage him to study the types delineated in their native haunts. A third motive is suggested by the inscription at the foot of the title-page: "Published for the author by M. Kane and Co." If, as we anticipate, the reader is bored rather than amused, if his desire to study Indian life is not whetted by his perusal of these sketches, at any rate the author has enjoyed the pleasure of seeing himself in print. The preface promised a delineation of many out-of-the-way Indian characters; but from anything that we gather from the author's account of them, they might, with few exceptions, equally well be Europeans or Chinese in Indian costume with an Indian background, or we might even number many of them amongst our own English acquaintances. The only difficulty arises from the absence of individuality in the characters. They might easily be one man in many costumes. The author's poverty of ideas is remarkable. The first essay, on the cat, might have been written by any schoolboy of fifteen with the aid of a dictionary of synonyms, and the whole volume might have been written by the same schoolboy after six months' residence in India. The author's style is the style of a man who is perfectly familiar with all the ordinary simple forms of English, but instead of confining himself to the uses with which he is most conversant, he has bought a dictionary of synonyms and thumbed its pages assiduously in the spirit of craving for variety that animates the football reporter in the sporting journals. His wit belongs to that species which consists in substituting circumlocution for directness: to melt is to "deliquesce," thirst is "the bibulous powers," obliging is "humoursome," an old proverb becomes "the excellent maxim which places cleanliness next to the possession of an angelic disposition," sleep masquerades as "*somnus*," another trite saying appears thus, "a certain sable personage with wings and horns is supposed to find plenty of work of a questionable nature for those who have more leisure than they know what to do with" (why will Mr. Pai call himself "an idle citizen"?), going to the dogs is "going to the interesting quadrupeds of the canine species," an egg is described as "a white ellipsoid which, when fresh laid, is quite a *bon-bouche* (*sic*) for an epicure," as "an incohate duplicate of the hen and her proud lord," as "a little white pellet of dormant life." It will be noticed that Mr. Pai does not hesitate to sacrifice accuracy to variety at times. We pass over a number of minor errors which might in another case have been laid to the charge of the printer, but in this case could, on strong presumptive evidence, be attributed to the author, in order to cull a few flowers of grammar and rhetoric at random: "As a playmate for the children the temper of the cat is extremely uncertain. . . . . The sudden use of her paw produces long red marks of a painful character on the poor victim's delicate skin." "Himself assumes the roll of judge." "Put a stopper on the phials of their wrath." "A glorious sense of insecurity rather trying to the nerves." "If you think that the true *raison de etre* (*sic*) of cavalry is to look grand . . . . *cadit quaestio*."

Whenever Mr. Pai ventures to express an opinion on any topic of political or social interest he evidently inclines to the official view, though he has not taken much trouble to secure himself against the charge of inconsistency. He sympathises with the sahib who is forced to pay for brutality in his treatment of a servant, and blames the officiousness of the division bench which has sufficient sense of equity to advise the sufferer to seek further redress in a civil court. He has nothing but cold scorn for the zealot who strives for reform, but he is not too proud to patronise the National Congress in a superior manner as an assembly of coolies. He affects an interest in the rational treatment of convicted criminals, and shrinks with apparent horror from the contemplation of the terrible effect of exemplary sentences on the novice in crime. "He carries within him that wonderful something we call a human soul. The precious possibility of living down his sin and shame, of fighting the powers of evil within him, and of rising triumphant, is not hopelessly gone. Yet how terrible the struggle before him! If in the past, when society yet held him within its pale, he tripped, what chance is now left to the poor wretch to make a bold stand?" Such is the glib commonplace cant of the man who, three pages before, describes the notorious horrors of an Indian prison thus: "A residence is kindly provided for him in one of those delightful establishments which serve as temporary asylums for people in a delicate state of moral health . . . . With his experiences within the walls of the prison we have nothing to do. They cannot be over-pleasant, as is shown by the frequently large mortality. But of course he must not be too particular." Are we taking the author too seriously? *Fluctus in simpulo*, no doubt, as Mr. Pai would have said, had his book of Latin quotations contained that particular phrase. But what a vast proportion of the world's sufferings proceeds from errors of taste rather than mistakes in morals, and how much

less troublesome in actual life is the wrongdoer than the "mild Philistine," as Mr. Pai terms himself, though we might prefer to qualify the adjective. "There are some people who never seem quite happy unless they can make others uncomfortable. I am sure they mean well, but that does not reconcile me to their meddlesomeness. Why will they not let us alone? Why will they be always making horrible revelations" of Philistinism and vulgarity? Oh, Mr Pai! *Mutato nomine, i e.*, with the addition of the last four words, *de te fabula narratur!* Nay, we doubt whether even so obscene a bird as the crow mentioned on page 100 of your volume could have brought himself to demand a place in your sketches.

SELF-CRITICISM.

Good Reading about Many Books, mostly by their Authors. Second year. (London: T. Fisher Unwin.)

Mr. Fisher Unwin, who is presumably responsible for this remarkable production (in fact, his position as head and forefront of the offending is typified by a wonderful design on the first page, which centres round a bust wherein we discern some resemblance to him), should really issue some directions to the authors of the various works which he desires to advertise. The fact of the material alteration of the aspect of the Glamorganshire coast-line by the fast falling or fast rising tide every few hours of the day is one the importance of which we do not desire to minimize. But its value as a recommendation of a book on Russian politics, even if we suppose that book to have been first suggested to the author in Glamorganshire, is distressingly small. We had just as lief read a treatise on the same subject inspired by the contemplation of the British Museum library. Similarly irrevelant pages make up quite half of the book under review. If no further instructions are given next year to the compilers of this annual, we would suggest that the title be altered by the omission of the word "good," which is not suitable to the present issue at any rate, and the substitution of "and" for "mostly by." Under the present circumstances, while we gather a vast deal of uninteresting and (rarely) interesting news about authors, there is very little to guide us in the choice of books from Mr. Fisher Unwin's catalogue. We learn that he numbers among his clients representatives of every grade of life, from a descendant (on the mother's side) of Caolbha, the one hundred and twenty-third and last monarch of the Irish race and forty-seventh king of Ulster, to a former *employé* of a German gentleman near Sydney, who, if he had worked, might have earned 7s. 6d. per rood for trenching and £3 per acre for clearing scrub; that Germany, France, Italy, Sweden, as well as all parts of the British Isles and British Empire, contribute to swell his list of publications; that amateur poetry, amateur psychology, amateur history, are alike welcome in Paternoster Square. Nay, more—you may study the portraits of the talented authors, as well as Mr. Joseph Pennell's conception of Mr. Fisher Unwin rising on eagle's wings across the stars. But not more than half-a-dozen of the contributors have had the wisdom to write an introduction to their own books. This is a pity; and the more so, because one or two of the sketches written for this purpose—we would instance Mr. George Jacob Holyoake's and Mr. Timothy Cole's—are really "good reading." Possibly the other authors could not, if they would, have done likewise. But they might, at any rate, have told us what they thought of their own work, and then we should have had some guide to its value. No man ever thought well of his best efforts. When Mr. Everard North frankly condemns his novel, we desire to read it; but when a poet is so filled with self-satisfaction as to write a poem for his own advertisement, we hesitate to buy his book—a hesitation justified, in the case of the two poets who have done this service for Mr. Fisher Unwin, by the extreme badness of the samples given to us.

India is fortunate in her representatives (leaving aside "Mimosa") in this volume. Mr. R. W. Frazer is one of the wise half-dozen, and in some six pages has told us, without once using the word "I," sufficient of the point of view from which he has approached the study of Indian mythology to show that in "Silent Gods and Sun-Steeped Lands" there has been an honest attempt to understand the religious position of the varied peoples of India without any misleading infusion of Western or modern ideas. Even more important is the translation of Bankim Chandra Chatterjee's novel, "Krishna Kanta's Will." An English public which greedily devours the Anglo-Indian fiction of Rudyard Kipling is willing to remain solidly ignorant as to the native literary powers of the inhabitants of India. If it thinks at all of the educated classes of that country, it does so by taking as a basis of serious and solemn thought the caricatures of *Punch*. Therefore this translation is likely to prove of service. A nation which can produce a novelist whose works are equal in force and insight to those of the greatest English writers is one worth the attention of this self-centred public. And the circulation of novels of this class in England will perhaps bring home to the English people the fact that this India which they rule is not a stage provided by Nature for the employment of the surplus population of the Universities and the acquisition of untold military glory by a few favoured officers, but is a land full of human beings with lives and minds that must be regarded.

"IMPERFECT DISINFECTION IS NO DISINFECTION AT ALL."

The Only Reliable Disinfecting Powder
IS
"CALVERT'S,"

Guaranteed to contain 15 per cent. CALVERT'S No. 5 Carbolic, the strongest disinfectant known.
In 6d., 1/-, and 1/6 Tins; also 7lb and 14lb. Cases, at 2/6 and 4/- each (English Rates).
Cheaper in use than Powders at lower rates, much less being needed. Will not clog pipes or drains.

☞ AVOID WORTHLESS IMITATIONS MADE WITH TAR OILS.

Dr. R. M. Gover, in Report to Director-General of Convict Prisons, says: "The preparations of Carbolic Acid supplied by Messrs. Calvert and Co. are, in my opinion, *much superior to those of any other manufacturer.*"

F. C. CALVERT AND CO., MANCHESTER.

ABOUT THE BURMAN.

The Burman, His Life and Notions. By SHWAY YOE. (London: Macmillan and Co.)

This is the second edition of Shway Yoe's book on Burma, and it is practically identical with the first edition published in 1882. It possesses at least one advantage over many books of the same class—it is the work of a man thoroughly conversant with his subject, not a record of the first impressions, nor the extended diary, of a hasty visitor to the country. No attempt is made at a history of Burma, but there is an excellent description of the state of the country under the two last kings. Though the government may have been admirable in theory, in practice it would appear that a worse system could hardly have been devised. Each official, whether high or low, was subject to immediate disgrace if he incurred the displeasure of his superiors, and an amusing anecdote shows what was the prevailing opinion as to the treatment of unpopular officers:—

> "When Mindohn Min heard that the elections had gone against the Ministry in 1874, and that Disraeli was to be Premier, he sighed and said, 'Then poor Go-la-sa-tong (Gladstone) is in prison I suppose. I am sorry for him, I don't think he was bad fellow.'"

Not only was the life and freedom of the official in jeopardy, but his salary depended upon the money he could raise for himself in the area for whose revenues he was responsible. Consequently, of course, the cultivators paid far more in taxes than ever reached the king's coffers. During the time of King Mindohn the country was further impoverished by the institution of monopolies, and these were only ostensibly removed by Theebaw when he ascended the throne. It is wonderful to read that the latter was, "on the whole, more popular than any king of Burma has been since the days of Alompra," for he was to all appearance an unscrupulous tyrant. Burma may gain something in wealth and development of trade by the introduction of a body of State-paid, and punctually paid, officials. At any rate the reason that Bishop Bigandet gave in 1880 for the comparative poverty of the Burmans—that if any one was suspected of being rich he became at once exposed to extortion, and even his life was endangered—should have ceased to operate. It is interesting to forecast the change that a settled Government is likely to produce in the character of the Burman. Will he always continue the happy-go-lucky person he is at present? Will his superfluous earnings always swell the wealth of the Pagodas or Madrasis? Or, will a Western Government bring a Western turn of mind and the Burman become as careful for to-morrow as any of us? It is undeniable that the rule under which he has lived has contributed to his present disposition in some measure, but natural tendency counts for something, and the extreme fertility of the country probably counts for more. The cultivation of paddy in the plains of Lower Burma involves the minimum of labour, and though too wet a season sometimes means the loss of a whole crop, it is then not too late to secure a second harvest, and there is always a market for the produce. There is another factor in the production of the Burman which should not be overlooked—his early education. While this continues to be given in the monasteries it is probable that the Burman will retain many of his present traits of character. And it does not seem likely that schools, so long-tried, and on the whole so excellent, will be readily superseded. At the present time we read that:

> "The Government and vernacular schools have had very little effect in reducing the number of scholars who go daily to study in the dimly-lighted schoolrooms of the monastery. Not even in Rangoon have the monks to call for scholars; they flock there abundantly of their own accord."

It is in domestic rather than in business functions that the Burmese appear to advantage. Their good-temper and willingness to please and be pleased have no drawbacks there, and in the chapters which are devoted to accounts of the plays and festivals in which they delight we have an interesting glimpse of the picturesque simplicity in which the Burmese live.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

APRIL, 1896.

GEOGRAPHICAL JOURNAL. Prince Henry of Orleans, "From Yun-nan to British India."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.). Turkhud, M.A., "A Lecture on Kathiawar." Dhingra, B.L., "Medical Aid for Indian Women."

PALL MALL MAGAZINE. Gough, Lieut-Gen., Sir Hugh, "Bengal Cavalry."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

APRIL, 1896.

HANKIN, E. H., M.A. ...."Cholera in Indian Cantonments, and how to deal with it." (Deighton, Bell and Co., Cambridge) 3s. 6d.

REV. J. E. PADFIELD, B.D., Missionary C.M.S Masulipatam..............."The Hindu at Home, being sketches of Hindu daily life." (Simpkin, Marshall. Madras, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge) .... 3s. 6d.

HANDBOOK OF INFORMATION FOR INDIAN STUDENTS, relating to University and professional studies, etc., in the United Kingdom, issued by the Committee of the National Indian Association. 8th edition. (Constable.) .... 1s. 6d.

LORD EGERTON OF TATTON.........."A Description of Indian and Oriental Armour." With an Introductory Sketch of the Military History of India. New edition. (W. H. Allen and Co.) — —

CLIVE CUTHBERTSON, Bengal Civil Service ......"A Sketch of the Currency Question." (Effingham Wilson) .... — —

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATION.

[C.—8037.]—EAST INDIA (NORTH-WEST FRONTIER). —Correspondence relating to the Occupation of Chitral .... 0s. 3d.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.